

HOLY MASS I.

John A. Bolger

1919



The Catholic Library—5

HOLY MASS
VOL. I.

ROEHAMPTON;

PRINTED BY JOHN GRIFFIN.

HOLY MASS

THE EUCHARISTIC SACRIFICE

AND

THE ROMAN LITURGY

BY

THE REV. HERBERT LUCAS, S.J.

VOL. I.

LONDON:

THE MANRESA PRESS, ROEHAMPTON, S.W.

E. HERDER, 68, GREAT RUSSELL STREET, W.C.

1914

Nihil Obstat:

S. GEORGIUS KIERAN HYLAND, S.T.D.,
CENSOR DEPUTATUS

Imprimatur:

✠ PETRUS EPÛS SOUTHWARC.

PREFATORY NOTE.

THE attempt to write yet another book about the Mass, while, for English-speaking Catholics, Dr. Fortescue's work on the Roman Liturgy holds the field, may be deemed, perchance, both presumptuous and inopportune. It has been thought, however, that there is room for a shorter and more popular treatment of the same subject, and I have been asked to undertake it. The following pages will, however, be found to contain no mere summary of Dr. Fortescue's more erudite and comprehensive treatise. Indeed, as will appear more particularly in Chapters X.—XIII. and XVI., the opinions here put forward on more than one question of some importance will be found to differ from those to which that distinguished scholar has given expression. A considerable portion of the contents of these two little volumes has, in substance, already appeared in print, in the form of articles contributed to *The Dublin Review* (1893—4), *The Tablet* (1896, &c.), *The Month* (1900 and 1902), and lastly to a couple of local magazines, viz., *The Xaverian* and *The Ignatian Record* (1908—10).

The matter of these articles has, however, been thoroughly revised and for the most part recast; and in the process sundry views which the writer had formerly held have been notably modified. It only remains for me to thank the Editors or former Editors of the above-named reviews and periodicals for permission to reproduce, as far as might be deemed advisable, the contributions in question.

HERBERT LUCAS, S.J.

*St. Francis Xavier's,
Liverpool,
January, 1914.*

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER I.

	PAGE
SACRIFICE AND SACRAMENT	I

CHAPTER II.

THE CHRISTIAN ALTAR AND THE HEAVENLY SANCTUARY	14
---	----

CHAPTER III.

PROPHET, PRIEST AND KING. THE PARTS OF THE MASS	24
--	----

CHAPTER IV.

THE ROMAN MISSAL AND ITS ANCESTRY . . .	31
---	----

CHAPTER V.

THE LITURGY: HIGH MASS AND LOW MASS: SUR- VIVALS AND ACCRETIONS	46
--	----

CHAPTER VI.

THE COLLECT, SECRETA AND POSTCOMMUNION	65
--	----

CHAPTER VII.

THE LESSONS FROM HOLY SCRIPTURE . . .	78
---------------------------------------	----

CHAPTER VIII.

THE OFFERTORY	93
-------------------------	----

CHAPTER I.

SACRIFICE AND SACRAMENT.

IN the Catechism of Christian Doctrine which is in use in our Catholic schools, and which is familiar to all of us, after a dozen or so of questions and answers concerning the Sacrament of the Holy Eucharist, we come to the words: "Is the Holy Eucharist a Sacrament only? No . . . it is also a Sacrifice"; words which, to a hyper-critical reader might almost suggest the thought that the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass should be regarded as in a manner subsidiary to the Sacrament of our Lord's Body and Blood. This, of course, is by no means the case. In dealing with the Sacrament before touching on the doctrine of the Church regarding the Mass, the compilers of our catechism have wisely followed the example set by the Fathers of the Council of Trent, both in their preliminary discussions, and also in the final reduction of the conciliar decrees and canons. And indeed the reasons which led them to adopt this course are not far to seek. For, until the dogmas of the Real Presence and of Transubstantiation have been established, it is plainly impossible to make good the sacrificial character of the Eucharist. In the words of our own Bishops: "If there were no power in the word of consecration to make the true body and blood of Christ really and objectively present, . . . we should not have on our altars

the Victim of Calvary, and without its Victim the sacrifice could not subsist."¹

Nevertheless, it is worthy of remark that logically, and one may even say historically, the Eucharistic Sacrifice is prior to the Sacrament, since the reception of the latter is essentially a participation in the former, and pertains to its integrity. The Sacrament, as received by the faithful in Holy Communion, is the fruit of the Sacrifice. It is not merely the Body and Blood of our Lord, together with His human Soul and His Divinity, which we receive, but His Body and Blood under the special aspect of a Victim which has been sacrificially offered. And this is a point on which it seems desirable to lay some stress, not merely on the general ground that every object of human knowledge gains in clearness by being looked at from various points of view, but also for a reason peculiar to the matter in hand. For it is incontestable that the sacrificial system of the Old Law, pointing as it does to the existence of some kind of eucharistic sacrifice under the New Dispensation, suggests considerations which are well calculated to predispose the mind of an enquirer after the truth towards the Catholic doctrine concerning the Sacrament of the Eucharist, apart from which, as has been said, the Eucharistic Sacrifice "could not," in fact, "subsist."

It would be superfluous and inopportune to enter here upon a discussion as to the origin of sacrifice, and as to the precise significance of its primi-

¹ "Vindication of the Bull on Anglican Orders," p. 12.

tive forms. Whatever may be the true answer to the question whether the idea of sacrifice has its ultimate roots in a natural instinct or in a primitive revelation, or whether, as is perhaps more probable, revelation came to the aid of instinct, to guide it and keep it in check, it may, at any rate, safely be said that the Sacrifice of the New Dispensation should be considered as immediately and designedly related rather to the fully developed system which it was to supplant, than to the more rudimentary institutions of remoter times. Whatever may have been the case in prehistoric ages, or among barbarous peoples, it is plain that in the levitical code the idea which lies at the root of all sacrifice is that of an offering, of an offering which affords a means of access to God, of an offering which is in some sense vicarious, as symbolical of the self-oblation of the offerer. To state the matter as briefly as possible, the notion of sacrifice and of self-sacrifice are indissolubly connected, even though the connection may often have been obscured, or forgotten, or overlooked.

Now this oblation, or self-oblation, might have three several ends or purposes. It might be a simple and yet most solemn acknowledgment of the supreme dominion of God; and this would seem to have been the true inward significance of the holocaust or whole-burnt offering. Or it might be in the nature of a thank-offering or peace-offering, terms which sufficiently explain themselves. Or again it might have for its specific purpose the removal of an obstacle, in the form of a sin or tres-

pass, which impeded the approach of the offender to God; in which case the sacrifice would be in the strict sense propitiatory. This threefold division of sacrifices according to their moral character or purpose is, it need hardly be said, explicitly and repeatedly recognized in Holy Scripture; and the order of enumeration, corresponding as it does to descending grades of dignity, is that which is followed in the opening chapters of the Book of Leviticus, where the subject is systematically dealt with. But the normal order of actual succession was necessarily different from this. For it is plain that for the attainment of the end ultimately desired, viz., full fellowship with God, it was needful that obstacles should first be removed; and accordingly, in the actual carrying out of the ritual, the sin-offering or the trespass-offering took precedence of the other kinds of sacrifice.¹ After the sin-offering, the holocaust; and then, to put the seal—as it were—upon the reconciliation already effected, came the thank-offering or peace-offering.²

It is next to be observed that there were certain characteristic details which differentiated these three kinds of sacrificial oblation, and which have an important bearing on the manifold significance of the unique and all-consummating Sacrifice of the New Law. That in the holocaust or whole-burnt offering the entire victim was consumed by fire on the altar, is sufficiently indicated by the terms employed to describe this species of

¹ *E.g.* Lev. xvi. 3. ² Lev. ix. 8, 12, 18.

sacrificial oblation in the Septuagint and in the Vulgate, as well as in the English versions, Catholic and Anglican. It is less clearly implied in the original Hebrew word '*olah*', which means a "sending up" or "causing to ascend." In the sacrifice for sin, a portion only of the victim was laid upon the altar, the remainder—when the ritual was carried out with full solemnity—being taken "outside the camp" to be there burnt as a thing unhallowed.¹ On these more solemn occasions at least, no portion of the victim might be eaten, either by the offerer or by the priest. It was only in the case of private and particular sin-offerings that the priests had their allotted portion reserved to them;² and this allowance must be taken to have been something of a derogation from the fuller symbolism of the more solemn ritual. The rite of the peace-offering was of a widely different character. Here the sacrificial meal was of primary importance. A portion of the victim was consumed by fire, a second portion was reserved for the priest or priests, but the greater part of the flesh was eaten by the offerer and his friends, special mention being made in the 22nd Psalm of the poor as guests at the feast.³

Now in a sentence which has been embodied in one of the prayers in the Roman Missal (the "Secreta" of the seventh Sunday after Pentecost), St. Leo tells us that in His one sacrifice Our Lord has united and consummated the ancient rites with all

¹ Lev. xvi. 27. ² Lev. vi. 18.

³ Lev. vii. 15; xix. 6; Ps. xxii. 27.

their diversities. The words, which like every other good example of ecclesiastical Latin suffer in the process of translation, are these: "Deus, qui legallium differentiam hostiarum unius sacrificii perfectione sanxisti; accipe sacrificium," &c. And indeed it is easy to see that Christ's offering of Himself was a holocaust by reason of its completeness, a propitiatory offering for sin by reason of its atoning efficacy and purpose, and finally a peace-offering whereby the atonement was not only made but sealed by a sacrificial meal. That the Sacrifice of Calvary had the character of a holocaust is not indeed asserted in express terms anywhere in the New Testament; but it is very clearly implied in the Epistle to the Hebrews, where the perfection of our Lord's self-offering is contrasted with the imperfections of the ancient sacrifices, the holocaust being included in the brief enumeration.¹ More explicitly the writer of the same Epistle calls attention to the fact that Christ suffered "extra portam"—"outside the gate," thus carrying out in His own person the symbolism of the sin-offering, in which (as has been said) the body of the victim was burnt "extra castra"—"outside the camp."² And he develops at considerable length the antitypal relation of the sacrifice of the Cross with that most solemn of all the expiatory sacrifices of the Old Law which was offered on the day of Atonement.³ Here, however, it will be well briefly to forestall a possible objection. It may

¹ Hebr. x. sqq.

² Hebr. xiii. 12 sq.

³ Hebr. ix. 6 sq.

be said that precisely in so far as Our Lord, by suffering "extra portam," fulfilled the special symbolism of the sin-offering, He departed from that of the holocaust. But the answer is easy, and ought to satisfy anyone but the most captious. For while from a merely human point of view Our Lord suffered as an outcast far from the temple precincts, yet His own body was the veritable temple or tabernacle of which the sacred edifice on Sion was but the type. "I banish you," says Coriolanus in the play, to the Roman Senators; and the Synagogue which spurned and rejected the Messiah was itself rejected of God. Where Christ was, there was the legitimate tabernacle and altar, and so the characteristic features of the holocaust were not wanting to His self-offering.

But it was essential to the antitypal perfection of this all-sufficing sacrifice that it should likewise include the specific qualities of a peace-offering; and these it can be said to have possessed only if the Holy Eucharist be taken into account. As in the peace-offerings of the Old Law the flesh of the victim was no less truly eaten than the victim itself was truly slain, so also—but after a more perfect manner—it must needs be in the case of the supremely perfect sacrifice of the New Dispensation. In the ancient rite, conditioned as it was by the limitations of material objects, only a portion of the victim could be offered on the altar, since a portion was to be eaten. Here the whole is offered and the whole is eaten. Moreover, the whole is eaten entire by every one of the faithful,

in accordance with the words of St. Thomas's hymn:

Sic totum omnibus, quod totum singulis;
 " So giveth He all to all that He giveth all to each."

And again:

Sumit unus, sumunt mille,
 Tantum isti quantum ille,
 Nec sumptus consumitur.

Which may be rendered thus:

Taketh one or take Him many
 Each hath much as all, nor any
 Can consume what all may eat.

But there is another point of correspondence to be noted. The sacrifices of the Old Law were divided, as regards the nature of the objects offered, into two classes, viz., those in which the blood of a living victim was shed, and the bloodless offerings of meal and wine. It must however be borne in mind that these two kinds of "oblata" were not *per se* mutually independent, but that the second class was supplementary to the first. In the 15th chapter of the Book of Numbers it is clearly laid down that for every animal victim that was immolated a certain measure of meal and of wine was likewise to be offered. It is also prescribed in the second chapter of Leviticus, that when an offering of meal was made, the priest was to lay a handful of the meal upon the altar "as a memorial."¹ The precise significance of this phrase is, indeed, extremely obscure; but bearing in mind the typological nature of the sacrifices of the Old Law, we should be led to expect,

¹ Lev. ii. 2.

under the New Dispensation, (1) that there would be a bloodless offering supplementary to the great Sacrifice of Calvary, and (2) that, in some way or other, this bloodless offering would have the character of "a memorial." How fully this antecedent expectation is fulfilled in the Holy Eucharist it is hardly necessary to point out. The Sacrifice of the Mass is supplementary to the Sacrifice of the Cross—in substance one with it, in act distinct from it—and it is, as our Lord Himself has told us, in the nature of a "memorial."

What has already been said will, it is hoped, have helped the reader to appreciate, in their special bearing on the Holy Eucharist, the force of St. Paul's assertion that the sacrifices of the Old Law were no more than "a shadow," and yet so far as they went a truthful shadow, "of good things" that were "to come"; and of his more definite assertion that "we have an altar whereof they have no power to eat, who"—after the final setting aside of the Old Dispensation—continue to "serve the tabernacle" of the levitical ordinances, preferring the shadowy type to the glorious reality.¹

How immeasurably this glorious reality does indeed surpass its shadowy types may in some degree be understood from the following considerations. With certain exceptions, to be found in the case of a sacrificial offering made by a priest on

¹ Hebr. x. 1; xiii. 10. The Pauline authorship, in substance if not as regards the very words, of the Epistle to the Hebrews is here assumed.

his own behalf, every sacrifice for which provision is made in the levitical ordinances, may be said to have involved a two-fold substitution; the substitution on the one hand of the priest, and on the other hand of the victim, for the person on whose behalf the sacrifice was offered. And on both counts these sacrifices were not merely imperfect, but of their very nature essentially and intrinsically inadequate. They were in the first place imperfect because the priest who offered them, even though he had been ceremonially set apart from his fellow-men for this very purpose and thereby invested with a kind of official sanctity, was, nevertheless, like his fellow-men, a sinner; and he was, therefore, in his personal capacity, unsuited to act as a mediator on their behalf. "For every high priest taken from among men is ordained for men in (or, unto) the things that appertain to God, that he may offer up gifts and sacrifices for sins; who can have compassion on them that are ignorant and that err, because he himself also is compassed with infirmity; and therefore he ought, as for the people, so also for himself, to offer for sins."¹

The levitical sacrifices were, in the second place, essentially imperfect and inadequate because the animals which were offered as a substitute for him who offered them, were of no intrinsic value in the sight of God. "If you should kindle the forests of a whole mountain side," He says in effect, "and consume in one great holocaust all the beasts that

¹ Hebr. v. 1—3.

dwell therein, it would be of no account in My eyes." "And Lebanon shall not be enough to burn, nor the beasts thereof sufficient for a burnt offering."¹ The substitution of a dumb animal for a man was a purely symbolic rite, having precisely the value of a symbol and no more. And the willingness of the victim to be thus offered by way of sacrifice, though crudely represented or simulated by means of garlands or gay trappings, was, after all, a mere legal fiction. But in the sacrifice of Calvary—perpetuated in the Mass—our great High Priest, Christ Jesus our Lord, was and is of unique dignity and of unique aptness for His office. For He possessed and possesses both the nature of God who was to be propitiated, and the nature of man on whose behalf the propitiation was to be made. It is in this sense that He was the ideally perfect Mediator, the "one Mediator," by means of an all-sufficient oblation, between man and God.² For the Victim again, was of infinite price; and besides this, since Priest and Victim were one, there was in this case no mere symbolical substitution of an unwilling animal for a being of a higher order, but an entirely voluntary self-substitution of the infinitely worthy for the graceless sinner.

Another reflection may fitly find expression here. It is one which, though it more immediately concerns such as are in priestly orders, has its application to the laity also, and it may be usefully called to mind as often as we say or hear Mass.³

¹ Isaiah xl. 16.

² 1 Tim. ii. 5. Cf. Hebr. viii. 6; ix, 15; xii, 24,

³ Cf. Lucas, *At the Parting of the Ways*, pp. 238 ff.

The grace of ordination to the priesthood not only confers the power of consecrating the sacred elements, and so of offering—in union with our Lord—the bloodless sacrifice of His Body and Blood; but it also stimulates or should stimulate the priest to make a complete and unreserved self-offering, in union with the self-offering of Christ whose priesthood he shares. As Christ was both Priest and Victim, so should the members of His priesthood be. Nor is this a new-fangled or far-fetched notion. Every Christian altar, as we know, has the character of a tomb or sepulchre, inasmuch as it contains enshrined within it or beneath it, the relics of martyrs, in accordance with those words of the Apocalypse: “I saw beneath the altar [in heaven] the souls of them that were slain for the Word of God and for the testimony which they held.”¹ The usage, and the hallowed words on which it is founded, alike remind us that the sufferings of the martyrs are incorporated as it were and made one with the sufferings of Christ, and that, in virtue of this incorporation, they are accepted by God as a true and efficacious sacrifice.

Nor, as has been said, is this a matter which concerns priests alone. The whole body of the faithful, in virtue of their vital union with Christ our Lord, may be regarded as in some sense participating in His priesthood, and all are or may be associated with Him in His function as a propitiatory victim. It was not to ecclesiastics alone, but to the faithful at large, that St. Paul wrote:

¹ Apoc. vi. 9.

“ I beseech you, therefore, by the mercy of God, that you present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, pleasing unto God, your reasonable service.”¹ Instances of the Christian spirit of self-sacrifice among the laity abound, not only in the history of the Church at large, but in the unwritten records of the hidden life of the poor in every city and country of the world. May they abound yet more in the years that are to come. Nor is there any more efficacious means whereby this desirable consummation may be brought about than diligence in hearing Holy Mass as often as we can, and more especially by that fuller participation in the Holy Sacrifice which is afforded by frequent and—when possible—daily Communion.

¹ Rom. xii. 1.

CHAPTER II.

THE CHRISTIAN ALTAR AND THE HEAVENLY SANCTUARY.

SOME further observations on the sacrificial character of the Mass may usefully engage our attention before we proceed to consider the liturgy in detail.

In the great majority of theological treatises on the Holy Eucharist which have been published since the Council of Trent, it has been either asserted or assumed that the idea of sacrifice involves that of an offering made by way of "destruction." And since in the Holy Eucharist as such there is no physical "destruction," theologians have been greatly puzzled to explain how the definition of a "sacrifice" is verified in the Mass. Vasquez, for instance, who has had many followers, states the matter thus: "Since by the force of the words, only the Body of Christ is put under the species of bread, and only His Blood under the species of wine—although under either species the whole Christ is present by concomitance—the consecration of the two separate species thus performed constitutes a representation of that separation of the Body from the Blood which makes death; and this representation is called a mystical separation. And the death itself is represented; therefore it is called a mystical slaying. . . . Before the consecration of the wine, the Body of Christ is not represented as dead

or immolated." Lugo on the other hand, whose opinion has been popularized by more than one English writer, holds that the essential idea of sacrifice, as involving some kind of "destruction," is realized in a certain "exinanition" (or "kenosis" as a modern writer might say) which our Lord undergoes in placing Himself under the sacramental species. It is a self-abasement comparable with that of the Incarnation, and in some respects going even beyond it. For in the Holy Eucharist He lies as it were dead upon the altar, not so much by virtue of the mystical separation of the Blood from the Body of which Vasquez speaks, as by the fact that the natural operations and functions of the human body are suspended in the sacramental state. It is in this assumption of the "status victimae," or of a "status declivior," that, in this view, the element of destruction or quasi-destruction is to be found. According to Lugo and those who follow him, the double consecration is essential to the sacrifice, not as a matter of intrinsic necessity and *ex natura rei*, but simply as a matter of positive institution.

It is needless to proceed further in the enumeration of the various theories that have been devised to meet the difficulty. The very fact of their diversity is enough to show that no plea of universal acceptance can be set up on behalf of any one of them. Roughly speaking, they are all reducible—as has been already implied—to the statement that in the act of consecration there is some kind of "moral" or "equivalent" destruction, and that

thus the "ratio sacrificii" is saved. But all such explanations leave it open to the objector to say: "If destruction is a necessary element in sacrifice, then where the destruction is real, there will be or may be a real sacrifice; but where the destruction is only 'moral' or 'symbolical' or 'equivalent' (which really means not quite equivalent) the rite, however solemn, will be a sacrifice only in some moral or symbolical or equivalent—or not quite equivalent—sense."

In our own days the suggestion has been made—and the point has been developed and insisted on by more than one distinguished theologian—that the whole of this difficulty has been occasioned by a misapprehension as to the precise part which "destruction" holds in the notion of sacrifice, or—to state the matter slightly otherwise—as to the part which destruction actually held in the sacrificial system of the Mosaic law. That animal victims offered in sacrifice must be slain is, of course, beyond dispute. Yet even in the case of animal victims it is particularly deserving of notice that the actual slaying of the victim was by no means the most important item in the ritual. Indeed, the act of slaying the victim was not *per se* a priestly function at all. It could be performed, and usually was performed, not by the priest, but by the person who made the offering. The priest's duty was to receive the victim's blood, to pour it about the altar, to lay upon the altar the body or a portion of the body, according to the nature of the sacrifice, and, of course, to kindle the fire by which

it was to be consumed. The distinction between the part which was assigned to the offerer and that which was proper to the priest is quite clearly laid down at the outset of the Book of Leviticus; and it certainly should not be left out of account in any serious discussion of the subject. The case has been forcibly stated by Wilhelm and Scannell, in a passage which summarizes the teaching of Professor Schanz:

The notion of offering (*oblatio, prosphora*) may be taken as the fundamental notion of all sacrifices The burning or out-pouring of the gifts hands them over to God, and through their acceptance God admits the giver to communion with Him. For the essential character of the sacrificial gift is not its destruction, but its handing over and consecration to God. . . . The out-pouring of the libation and the killing of the animals are but the means for handing over the gift to God, and for bringing the giver into communion with Him. The killing necessarily precedes the burning, but the killing is not the sacrifice. 'The victim is killed in order to be offered'¹; in other words the killing is preparatory to the sacrifice. More importance attaches to the blood of the victim which is gathered and poured out at the altar. For, according to ancient ideas, the life, or the soul, is in the blood. When, therefore, the blood is offered, the highest that man can give, viz., a soul or a life, is handed over to God. . . . [Again] the sanctifying power of fire is as well known as the rôle it

¹ Greg. M. in Ezech i. 2, Hom. 10, 19.

plays in heathen mythologies. God Himself was a fire, 'Our God is a consuming fire,'¹ or the fire was a power sent down from heaven, and frequently the heavenly fire is said to have consumed the victim. . . . The independent unbloody sacrifices can only be explained from the same point of view, viz., that they express oblation of self to, and union with, God. . . . Sacrifice in general may, therefore, be defined as 'the offering to God, by an authorized minister, of an actual gift of something of our own transformed by the consecration of the minister, and thus passing into the dominion of God, Who accepts the gift for the sanctification of the offerer.'"²

To say, however, that the slaying of the victim is not the sacrificial act *par excellence* is a very different thing from saying (what would be altogether untrue) that the victim's death is not of the essence of sacrifice. The animal sacrifices of the Old Law were, as has already been said, an attempt to shadow forth the voluntary self-offering of a vicarious substitute. But as was also said, it is to be remembered that every sacrifice involved a double substitution, viz., that of the victim, and—under another aspect—that of the priest for the offerer. And it is only another way of expressing the same truth to say that the priest was in a very true sense a substitute for the victim. As victim, the animal represented the offerer. As presenter of the victim the priest performed on its behalf what by the

¹ Hebr. xii. 29.

² Wilhelm and Scannell, *Dogmatic Theology* (1898), ii. 451.

nature of the case the victim could not (even had it been otherwise capable) have done for itself. Hence it is explicitly noted, as an element in the perfection of the sacrifice of Christ, that in this case Priest and Victim were one and the same. And yet even here the idea of substitution was not wanting, for here the all-perfect Victim was self-offered for his people. In the divine tragedy of Calvary it is plain that it was not the act of slaying our Lord that constituted the sacrifice, but our Lord's acceptance of the death inflicted on Him. But it is also plain that the death was inflicted by those, or the representatives, on whose behalf the sacrifice was offered; so that in this respect also the typology was preserved or realized.

Although, however, in the case of a living victim, death by the shedding of blood was of the very essence of the sacrifice, inasmuch as it was a necessary and indispensable preliminary to the presentation of the flesh and the blood to God upon the altar, it is by no means clear that in the case of a commemorative sacrifice, in which, after the shedding of the blood "once for all," the same Victim is offered again and again, we are compelled to look for a repeated equivalent of the bloodshedding, or for an element of real or equivalent "destruction." Under the limitations which conditioned the offering of animal victims, anything in the nature of a repetition of the offering was plainly impossible, even had there been reason for such repetition. But these limitations being absent in the case of the supreme sacrifice of

Christ, it would seem that the sacrificial "presentation" or "oblation" of the Victim might be repeated indefinitely, and that nothing more was required in order to the realization of the idea of a true bloodless sacrifice than that the presentation or oblation should be made by means of a suitable outward and significant rite, not necessarily involving any sort of "destruction." That the rite actually chosen and instituted by our Lord does in fact "show forth His death" by virtue of the separate consecration of the host and of the chalice, is of course a truth to be maintained and cherished; and our attention is pointedly called to it by the words "mysterium fidei" ("the mystery of faith"), which are embodied in the form of consecration of the chalice. Nevertheless, in view of the divergence of opinions among theologians, it would seem to be desirable not to lay undue stress upon any of the particular explanations of the "ratio sacrificii" in the Mass, as though, if this particular explanation (*e.g.*, that of Vazquez or De Lugo) were mistaken, the "ratio sacrificii" would be lacking.

The point may be aptly illustrated by means of a comparison. In treating of the mystery of man's redemption two questions must be distinguished, viz.: (1) What was necessary in order that Christ our Lord might redeem mankind? and (2) how did our Lord in fact redeem mankind? To the first question the answer is that any single act of the God-Man would have been sufficient for the purpose. To the second the answer is that in fact

our Lord redeemed us by dying on the cross. And to this simple statement may be added many considerations which bring into prominence the manifold congruity of the "plentiful redemption," going so far beyond the mere intrinsic necessities of the case, whereby we were redeemed.

Precisely so in dealing with the Sacrifice of the Mass we must distinguish between two questions, viz.: (1) What were the necessary and sufficient conditions to be fulfilled in order that the Mass might be a true sacrifice? and (2) what is it that in fact makes the Mass a true sacrifice? The first question has reference to the intrinsic necessities of the case, the second concerns the actual institution of the Eucharistic Sacrifice. To the first question it should, I think, be answered that—so far as we can see—any rite which God might have chosen to institute, whereby the Divine Victim, once slain, should be again self-offered upon an altar, would have been sufficient for the verification or realization of the "ratio sacrificii." For instance, it was not—so far as we can see—intrinsically impossible that there should have been a eucharistic sacrifice "under one kind," had it pleased God so to ordain; and it is at least exceedingly doubtful whether we are justified in postulating any second "destruction" or "quasi-destruction" or "mystical destruction" of the Victim, once slain, as an indispensable element in the rite. But to the second question the answer must be that, at least *de facto*, at least as a matter of positive divine ordinance, the particular rite whereby it has

pleased our Lord to offer Himself again upon the Christian altar, and therefore the particular act by virtue of which the Holy Eucharist is a true sacrifice, consists in the double or separate consecration. And here again it is easy to point out the manifold congruity of the divine choice. So, too, the view he had taken leaves quite untouched the opinion of Lugo, in so far as this opinion has reference to the congruity of the actual form of the Eucharistic oblation rather than to its very essence. And thus the teaching of Vazquez and Lugo, instead of being opposed to one another, become mutually complementary, each emphasizing an important aspect of a many-sided truth. But it is important, as it seems to me, to avoid creating a gratuitous difficulty by laying down, as though it could be proved *à priori*, that what God has in fact done it was intrinsically necessary that He should do in order that the Mass might be a true sacrifice.

By way of supplementing and completing what has already been said, it may be useful to return for a moment to the relation which the death of the victim held to the completed sacrificial ritual. The death was necessary, not merely that the physical acts of pouring out the blood and burning the flesh might be accomplished, but that the very life of the victim, conceived of as being contained in the blood, might be removed, as it were, to another sphere of existence. Not, of course, that the soul of an animal could really survive its immolation. But this was precisely one of those many limitations by reason of which the sacrifices of the Old

Law were mere types and symbols. The symbolical presentation of the animal's life—conceived as still contained in the blood—to God, was a faint foreshadowing of the act whereby our Lord, triumphant over death, offered or presented on our behalf the life which He had laid down yet not lost. It is particularly noteworthy that both in the Apocalypse and in the Epistle to the Hebrews the sacrifice of Christ is regarded as in a manner perennial and continuous, at least so far as regards the ritual act of the self-presentation of the Divine Victim. Christ having died on the Cross entered into the heavenly sanctuary to offer or present on our behalf, not the blood of goats and heifers, but His own.¹ And he entered that heavenly sanctuary, not—like the levitical High Priest—to withdraw after a few moments, but to make everlasting intercession for us.² So, too, on the Apocalyptic altar the Lamb for ever stands “as it were slain,” *i.e.*, bearing all the marks of death, yet ever living, a propitiatory Victim to the end of time.³ And what—according to our way of reckoning—takes place in heaven continuously or perennially, is reproduced on earth, not indeed continuously in any single place, but daily and hourly on ten thousand altars “from the rising of the sun even to its going down.”⁴

¹ Hebr. ix. 12.

² Hebr. vii. 25.

³ Apoc. v. 6.

⁴ Mal. i. 11.

CHAPTER III.

PROPHET, PRIEST AND KING.

THE PARTS OF THE MASS.

SOMETHING has been said, in the foregoing chapters, of Holy Mass as a sacrifice, having for one of its chief fruits the Holy Sacrament of the Eucharist. But before entering into an examination of the details of the liturgy, that is to say, of the lessons, the psalmody, the prayers, and the ceremonies in which the central act of sacrifice is enshrined, it may be worth while to take account of a truth that is too often overlooked, viz., that in the Mass, as it is actually celebrated all the world over, and not in the Roman rite alone, our Lord exercises, through His ministers, a threefold function, even as he exercised a threefold function in His visible human life on earth. He came, as we all know, in the character (1) of the supremely great Prophet or Teacher, (2) of the supremely perfect High Priest of the New Dispensation, and (3) of the King whose royalty was not of this world but who was to found and rule over an everlasting kingdom which is to have its final consummation in heaven. As Prophet, as God made Man that He might become His own messenger to mankind, He claims our faith. As our High Priest He laid, by His all-atoning sacrifice, the foundations of our hope. As King He appeals to our loyalty and love. Now to this threefold function of Christ our Lord

correspond the three main portions into which the sacred liturgy of the Mass, apart from preliminaries and supplementary accretions, is divided.

I. The first portion, the "*Missa catechumenorum*," as it was once called, which corresponds with the teaching office of our Lord, consists, chiefly, though not exclusively, of lessons from Holy Scripture, followed, in the case of the principal parochial Mass on Sundays, by a homily on the Gospel of the day, and, at all Masses on Sundays and on certain other days, by the chanting or recitation of the "*Credo*." It is plain that an appeal is here made primarily to our faith, a point which it is well to bear in mind, whatever "method of hearing Mass" we may adopt. Or, to express the same truth in a different form, our Lord in Holy Mass feeds us with the bread of the word before feeding us with His Body in the Holy Sacrament. A recent writer has indeed laid stress, undue stress, as it seems to me, on the fact—assuming it to be a fact—that this first portion of the Mass had its origin in a religious service distinct from the Holy Sacrifice. Now, that from the earliest times, doctrinal and catechetical services have been held apart from the Mass, and that these services did in fact take a form similar or at least analogous to that of the "*Missa catechumenorum*," inasmuch as they embodied the reading of passages from Holy Scripture, alternating with psalmody and prayer and followed by a homily, need not be called into question. Instances may be found in the "*Peregrinatio Silviae*" (or "*Etheriae*"), a

very notable pilgrim-book of the fourth century; and indeed they may be found nearer home in the Matins and Lauds of the Divine Office. But with the exception of that apostolic age during which the Holy Sacrifice was immediately preceded by the Agape, without perhaps, the interposition of any reading or homily, it may be doubted whether any instance can be found of the celebration of Mass apart from an introductory doctrinal exordium.¹ The catechumens were excluded from being present at the "Missa fidelium"; but the faithful were expected, or they still are, to attend the "Missa catechumenorum" which preceded it.

II. That the second great division of the Mass, which embraces the offertory, preface and Canon, constitutes the specifically sacrificial portion of the service, is a statement which might seem to need neither proof nor illustration. At any rate, whatever it does need under either head, will be set forth later. The point on which I wish to insist at present is the relation of this central portion of liturgy to the virtue of hope. More than once in the epistle to the Hebrews St. Paul insists on the truth that our hopes of life everlasting rest entirely on the sacrifice offered by Christ our Lord. He speaks of "the hope set before us, which we have as an anchor of the soul, sure and firm, and which entereth in, even within the veil, where

¹ Cf. Cabrol, *Origines Liturgiques*, pp. 333 ff. The truth of the statement made above is not, as it seems to me, affected by the circumstance that the Mass might be commenced in one church (where the lessons were read) and, after a procession, continued and finished in another.

the fore-runner Jesus is entered for us, being made a High Priest forever according to the order of Melchisedech."¹ He tells us that our Lord "hath an everlasting priesthood whereby He is able also to save forever them that come to God by Him"²; that He is "the Mediator of a better testament" than that which was given to Moses, "which is established on better promises"³; that "Jesus is not entered into the Holies," *i.e.* a sanctuary "made with hands, . . . but into heaven itself, that He may appear now in the presence of God for us"⁴; and lastly that "we have a confidence in the entering into the Holies," that is to say, a sure hope that we shall, if we be faithful to God's law, enter into the heavenly sanctuary, "by the Blood of Christ," who has opened for us "a new and living way," being "a High Priest over the house of God."⁵

Of course I am well aware of the objection that may be raised by non-Catholics against the appeal, in this connection, to the passages which have just been quoted, inasmuch as all of them have reference, primarily, to the Sacrifice of Calvary. For the purpose of the present chapter, however, it is assumed that the Eucharistic sacrifice is a perpetuation of the sacrifice offered on the Cross, and that what is said of the efficacy of the one is, by consequence, true also of the other.

It can hardly be doubted that the hearing of

¹ Hebr. vi. 18—20. ² Hebr. vii. 24, 25.

³ Hebr. viii. 6. ⁴ Hebr. ix. 24.

⁵ Hebr. x. 19—21.

Mass will more efficaciously help to strengthen the tempted and console the afflicted if due attention is paid to this intimate and special connection of the Holy Sacrifice, as such, with the virtue of hope, than if it were overlooked. By the words "Sursum Corda," and by the prayers, "Communicantes" and "Nobis quoque peccatoribus," we are not only bidden to lift our hearts above earthly cares and vanities, but reminded that our fellowship is with the saints who are gone before us, and that our true franchise (our "conversation" as the Douay Version has it) is in heaven.¹ And this in virtue of that very sacrifice—one with that of the Cross—at which we are assisting. The hearing of Mass should be to us as a vision of the true Jacob's ladder, reaching from earth to heaven, the ascent of which has been made possible for us solely by the merits of Christ's Precious Blood shed for us on Calvary, and through all time offered for us on the Christian altar.

III. If the Mass of the Catechumens appeals to our faith, and the prayers and ceremonies which more immediately accompany the act of sacrifice are calculated and intended to keep alive and re-awaken our hopes of eternal life, it is plain enough that the concluding portion of the Mass, of which Holy Communion, received either sacramentally or spiritually, either personally or (so to say) vicariously, is the essential element, has a no less specific relation to the virtue and disposition of charity or

¹ Phil. iii. 20.

love. This is so palpably evident that there is no need to labour the point.

It is, however, not so obviously plain that charity has a special relation with the kingly office of our Lord. Yet that this is so there can, I believe, be no reasonable doubt. The love which is demanded of us is not, primarily, affective but effective; its seat is not in the feelings or emotions but in the will; not sentiment but loyalty is the tribute that is due from us; and it is a tribute due to our Divine Saviour as our Sovereign Lord and Master. "If you love Me, keep My commandments,"¹ He says; and if the lowest and most indispensable kind of charity consists in obedience, the highest manifestations of the love of Christ are those of the Saints who, with a more generous loyalty, have followed more closely in His footsteps, fighting under His Standard of the Cross, and rejoicing to suffer with Him.

So much for charity, or the love of our Lord, in general. As regards the Holy Eucharist in particular, it is as a King that Christ, the Bridegroom, woos His Bride, the Church, the Holy Eucharist is the chief pledge of his love, and Holy Communion is "the marriage-feast of the King's Son,"² or rather, perhaps, a foretaste of that marriage-feast in its full consummation.³ It is, in the same inchoate sense, "the marriage-feast of the Lamb,"⁴ of "the Lamb that was slain"⁵ and yet liveth for-

¹ St. John xiv. 15.

² St. Matth. xxii. 2 ff.

³ Apoc. xix. 7.

⁴ Apoc. xix. 7.

⁵ Apoc. v. 6, 9, 12.

ever and "whose name is King of kings and Lord of Lords."¹ "Blessed are they that are called to the marriage-supper of the Lamb"²; and it is well that we should know and recognize, even "as in a glass, darkly,"³ the blessedness that is ours in this Sacrament of union and love.⁴

¹ Apoc. xvii. 14. ² Apoc. xix. 9. ³ 1 Cor. xiii. 12.

⁴ For the leading ideas of this chapter I am indebted to reminiscences of certain sections in the fourth volume of Dr. Amberger's *Pastoral-Theologie*, a work which I have not been able to consult again at the time of writing.

CHAPTER IV.

THE ROMAN MISSAL AND ITS ANCESTRY.

IT may be useful to state, at the outset of the present chapter, that the terms "Mass," "the Mass," or "a Mass," must here be understood as having reference to the verbal or printed text of the liturgical service, and not primarily to the great sacrificial act of which the verbal or printed text is but the outward vesture. Looking at the text as a whole, it is found to consist, mainly, of (1) Prayers, (2) lessons from Holy Scripture, and (3) choral pieces. Of the Scripture lessons and the choral pieces it will not be necessary to say anything in detail just at present. But of the prayers this much at least must here be noted, viz.: That they are either (1) fixed or (2) variable: that the fixed prayers are those which belong to (*a*) the "Ordinary" and (*b*) the "Canon" of the Mass (though the Canon allows of certain minor variations on the Festivals, and during the Octaves of Christmas, Epiphany, Easter, Ascension Day and Pentecost); that, of these two portions, the Canon, which extends from the end of the Preface to the Pater Noster exclusively, is thoroughly Roman in structure and composition, while the prayers which make up the bulk of the Ordinary are of later introduction, and are probably in large measure of Gallican origin or provenance; and lastly, that the variable prayers are the Collect, the Secreta, and the

Post-Communion (with, on occasion, the “*Oratio super populum*”), which vary from day to day, and the Preface, which, roughly speaking, varies with the season.

Now the Roman Missal, by which for present purposes must be understood the official “*Missale Romanum*” with its authentic supplements, as distinct from sundry abridged and adapted translations thereof, contains the full text of all the Masses which must or may be sung or said on every day of the year. I say “which must or may be sung or said,” because there are days on which a certain liberty of choice is allowed. For instance, on minor festival days occurring during Lent, the celebrant has the option of saying either the Mass of the feast or that of the feria; and there are many occasions, in the course of the year, on which “votive” Masses (*e.g.*, a Mass for the deceased) may be celebrated. Of the Roman Missal it may be truthfully said that it derives its descent from the particular copy of St. Gregory’s Mass-book which, at the Emperor’s own request, Pope Hadrian I. sent to Charlemagne, to serve as a guide and pattern for the liturgical usage of all the churches in his dominions. And it is to this origin that we owe the indications, in Missals intended for use all the world over, of the local Roman “Stations,” of which something must be said hereafter.

It would, however, be a mistake to imagine that nothing more is needed except the omission from the Roman Missals of the prayers, lessons and an-

tiphons proper to festivals of later origin, in order to get back to St. Gregory's Mass-book. And this for the simple reason that St. Gregory's Mass-book was not, strictly speaking, a "Missal." The Missal as we know it has, in fact, arisen out of the fusion of some four or five distinct books. In the days when all books were in manuscript, and liturgical books usually or commonly engrossed on parchment, it is easy to understand that economy in material and in labour was an all-important consideration. The Mass, so far as the words and ceremonies were concerned, was a highly dramatic service, in which the celebrant, the deacon, the sub-deacon, and the choir or "schola cantorum," each had their appointed parts; and it was obviously reasonable that each should have a book containing only the portion of the service which pertained to himself. The celebrant, in primitive times and in the early Middle Ages, did not himself read the Epistle and the Gospel, or the choral parts of the Mass; and accordingly his book—the "Sacramentarium" as it was called—did not contain these. Its contents consisted of the Canon (for the "Ordinary" was of later introduction), together with the variable prayers (collects, secretæ, and postcommunions) and the prefaces, with, it may be added, an appendix of sundry forms of blessing, etc. The deacon's book, the "Evangelarium," contained Gospels only, and the sub-deacon in like manner had his Lectionary, unless, indeed, as would often be the case, the lessons were read from a Bible or New Testament, or from

a volume containing some portions thereof. For, as is well known, marginal notes, indicating the commencement and end of the liturgical lessons, are found in many early Biblical MSS. So too, the cantors and the choir had the book or books which, under the various names of "Antiphonarium," "Graduale," "Cantatorium," contained, set to musical notation, the choral portions of the Mass, *i.e.*, introits, graduals, tracts and sequences, and the antiphons at the offertory and Communion. "Antiphonarium," it may be observed, is a more comprehensive term than "Graduale" or "Gradale." In Rome the Graduale was called "Cantatorium."¹

This at any rate was the ideal, and no doubt in cathedrals and great abbey churches the normal usage. But it is hardly to be supposed that in the eighth and ninth centuries, for instance, every parish priest had in his possession a full set of liturgical books, and it is at least probable that many had to be content with a small manual more or less similar to the "Stowe Missal." This is an early Irish Mass-book which resembles our modern missals in that it contains the entire text of the liturgy, and not merely the celebrant's part, while on the other hand it contains only three Masses, one for ordinary use ("cottidiana"), one for Saints' days, and one for the dead.

To sum up the whole matter in a few words:—Our present usage, by which the celebrant reads the whole of the Mass, including the parts ori-

¹ Amalarius in *P.L.* cv. 1245; *Cath. Encycl.* i. 579.

ginally proper to deacon, sub-deacon and choir, as well as his own, must needs have had its origin in what is now known as a "Low Mass"—*i.e.*, a Mass without deacon, sub-deacon or choir; a form of celebration which necessarily presupposes the combination in a single volume of elements proper to the sacramentary, lectionary, and gradual respectively. This fusion naturally took place at first on a small scale and in a fragmentary fashion, as in the "Stowe Missal," and it reached its final stage of completeness for all churches, however obscure, only when the invention of printing had facilitated the multiplication of copies, and the enforcement, by pontifical decrees, of liturgical uniformity.

And now, let us turn to the Roman Missal itself, and examine its contents. Let it be supposed that the reader has in his hands a copy of the "Missale Romanum," such as ought to be in the hands of every one who can read and understand the simple yet stately Latin of the Church's liturgy.

The volume is divided into the following parts:—

(1) The "Proprium de Tempore" or Proper of the Season. This contains the Masses for all the Sundays in the year, beginning with Advent Sunday, for Ascension Day and Corpus Christi, and for the week-days in Lent, Easter-week and Whitsun-week, the Rogation days, and the Ember days occurring in September and December. It is in the nature of a survival from a more primitive arrangement that the Masses for the Christmas

season, *i.e.*, from Christmas Eve till the Octave of the Epiphany, though determined by the day of the month and not by the day of the week, yet find a place in the "Proprium de Tempore." In other words this collocation of the Christmas festivals points back to a time when the "Sanctorale" (of which presently) had not been separated from the "Temporale."

The circumstance that the Ordinary and Canon of the Mass, with the variable prefaces, find their place, not as might have been expected at the beginning or at the end of the book, but immediately before the Mass for Easter Sunday, calls for a word of explanation. It has been suggested that this arrangement is really due to considerations of convenience, in as much as the book opens more easily in the middle. It seems to me, however, more likely that the position of the Canon in the Missal is not unconnected with the fact that the great festival of Easter was the nucleus from which the ecclesiastical calendar was developed. This, if I understand him rightly, is Ebner's opinion; but he points out that the practice varied in successive centuries. In the earliest extant MSS., from the seventh century down to the close of the eighth, the Canon is found near the end of the book, either as a separate item or, more frequently, embodied in a "Missa cottidiana" or Mass for days not specially provided for. But from the beginning of the ninth century it takes its place, more naturally as one would think, at the beginning of the book. Finally, in MSS. of the twelfth and thir-

teenth centuries, it gradually settled down, so to say, into its present position; a position which it probably owes to the special honour which was felt to be due to the central solemnity of Easter.¹ At any rate there can be no question as to the practical convenience of the present arrangement.

(2) The "Proprium Sanctorum." This contains the Masses appointed for those festivals—chiefly Saints' days—which are determined by the civil calendar, *i.e.*, which are assigned to certain days of the successive months from November 27th, the earliest possible date for the first Sunday in Advent, to November 26th. It contains, in addition, the Masses for a few feasts of comparatively recent origin, which, like that of the Sacred Heart of Jesus, are determined by the days of the ecclesiastical and not of the civil calendar.

(3) The "Commune Sanctorum." As a matter of convenience certain Masses have been drawn up suitable for any saint of a particular class, Martyr Confessor, Virgin, &c., and it not unfrequently happens that the whole or part of the Mass for the festival of this or that individual servant of God is taken from the "Common of Saints," while in the case of others the whole of the variable portion of the Mass is "proper," that is to say, peculiar to their own feast.

(4) The "Commune Sanctorum" is followed by a series of "votive Masses," *e.g.*, the Mass of the Holy Ghost, the Mass of the Blessed Sacrament,

¹ Ebner, *Quellen u. Forschungen*, usw. pp. 363—372.

&c., and these again by the Masses for the deceased. The same part of the Missal likewise contains a long series of collects for particular intentions, "ad libitum sacerdotis," many of which are of quite singular beauty.

(5) Next follow, or may follow, certain authorized supplements, of which the first ("Pro aliquibus locis") forms part of the body of the Missal. This contains the Masses for a number of feasts which, though not universally observed, have been conceded to more than one country or region. The supplements for particular dioceses, or groups of dioceses (*e.g.*, those of England and Wales), and for particular religious orders, are published separately. And it may be useful to warn the reader that, in ordering a Missal from a publisher or bookseller, care should be taken to specify the supplements required, so that they may be bound up with the Missal. Some religious orders, however, have not merely a supplement, but a special Missal of their own, identical of course, in substance, with the "Missale Romanum," though differing from it in certain details.

It has already been mentioned that the nucleus of the Roman Missal, so far as its non-choral portions are concerned, is or was to be found in the copy of St. Gregory's Sacramentary sent by Pope Hadrian I. to Charlemagne. About this book a few words must here be added. The transaction is recorded in a letter written by the Pope to the Emperor between the years 784 and 791. He says in effect: "You have asked us to send you an unin-

terpolated (immixtum) copy of the Sacramentary arranged by our holy predecessor Pope Gregory. This we now do by the hands of John, Abbot of Ravenna.”¹ So much is clear, but it is unfortunately no less certain that not one of the many extant MS. copies of the “Gregorianum,” as we may henceforth call it, is by any means “immixtum,” for all of them have been, as Dom S. Bäumer has pointed out, “largely augmented from other sources,” mainly, perhaps, Gallican. It is true that, within a generation of the arrival of Hadrian’s MS., a serious and presumably successful attempt was made, by an editor who is believed to have been Alcuin, to purge the already inflated Gregorianum of its alien elements. So far as he adopted the plan of relegating these to a kind of supplement, or second and third “book,” separated from the older portion of the work by a “praefatiuncula” or “little preface” of his own (known as the “Hucusque”), his task of careful discrimination has been effective. But in many cases he was content to leave inserted material in the position in which he found it, merely indicating the later additions by means of asterisks or obeli. And it unfortunately happened that, notwithstanding his stringent directions, copyists omitted to reproduce these diacritical marks. Hence, to the question: “Can we restore St. Gregory’s Mass-book?” the answer must needs be, if not wholly negative, at best a

¹ *Cod. Carol.*, ed Jaffé, p. 274; *apud* Duchesne, *Origines*, p. 114.

very hesitating affirmative.¹ The question, however, concerns only the antiquity of particular Masses, and other points of quite secondary importance. It in no way affects the substance or general structure of the book, the whole of which is, of course, included in the later and "largely augmented" copies.

But the Gregorianum was not the earliest Roman Mass-book to gain a wide circulation. Indeed, a careful examination of numerous ninth-century catalogues of cathedral and monastic libraries led Bäumer to the conclusion, now I think generally accepted, that the purpose of Hadrian's gift was not—as used to be supposed—the substitution of the Roman for the early Gallican liturgy throughout the Frankish dominions, but rather the substitution of a correct and up-to-date Roman book for an earlier one, likewise Roman, which had for the most part already supplanted the old Gallican sacramentaries. This earlier Roman book is described in the catalogues as "Gelasian." In Rome the "Gelasianum," even in its original shape, had long since become obsolete, under stress of the liturgical reform introduced by St. Gregory. The nature of this reform is compendiously described by "John the Deacon," his biographer. "He reduced within the limits of a single book the Gelasian codex of Masses, eliminating much, effecting a few transpositions, and making some

¹ See an excellent article by Mr. E. Bishop in the *Dublin Review*, October, 1894. From this article Bäumer's words (above) are quoted.

additions.”¹ And this is all that we are told about the relation of the Gregorianum to the Gelasianum as regards the general structure of the two works. Of particular changes in detail, introduced by St. Gregory, mention will be made later, as occasion offers.

Of the Gelasianum several manuscript copies are extant, though, strange to say, not one of them mentions the name of its author or compiler in its title or superscription.² But there are, as it seems to me, no adequate grounds for calling in question the ascription of books of this type, at least as regards their chief contents, to Gelasius I. (c. 490). It is, however, recognized on all hands that, even in the earliest of them all, the original text has almost certainly been somewhat thickly overlaid with extraneous matter, from which the task of separating out the original text can hardly be said to have been attempted with any near approach to completeness. Not only are there extensive inter-

¹ “Sed et Gelasianum codicem de Missarum solemnibus, multa subtrahens, pauca convertens, nonnulla vero superadjiciens . . . in unius libri volumine coarctavit” (*Vita* ii. 17; *P.L.* lxx. viii. 94). Simple as this statement seems at first sight, it must be admitted that the words which follow “superadjiciens,” viz. “pro exponendis evangelicis lectionibus” have puzzled and baffled all the commentators. Nor can I pretend to explain them. There is nothing in the Gregorianum which can be said to serve “for the exposition of the Gospel lessons.”

² Bona (ii. v. 4) “suspects” that the Vatican *Cod. Reg.* 316 “contains the Ordo of Gelasius.” This is the MS. which Tommasi, Muratori, Vezzosi, and in our own days Mr. H. A. Wilson, have edited as “The Gelasian Sacramentary.” Mr. Wilson has of course collated other MSS.

polations from Gallican sources, but every known MS. of the Gelasianum has been to a greater or less extent "Gregorianized," particularly as regards the Canon of the Mass. Probst's observation that those sections in the Gelasianum which have the word "Ordo" in their title are of later date than those which have for their superscription "Orationes et preces," at least deserves mention.¹ For present purposes, however, it must be enough to say (1) that the Gelasianum, as represented by the earliest extant MS., is in three "books" (reduced by St. Gregory to one); and (2) that it has a very much larger number of collects (usually two for each Mass), of variable prefaces, and of variable clauses in the Canon of the Mass, than the Gregorianum.

Older still than the Gelasianum, but of quite a different character, is the so-called "Leonine Sacramentary" or Leonianum, which, however, has nothing to do with St. Leo the Great (c. 450), except that it probably dates from shortly after his time, and that many of its prayers are adaptations of passages from his sermons.² Of the Leonianum only one copy, a Verona MS., is known to exist, or, perhaps, ever existed. The number of collects, prefaces, and even of complete

¹ Probst (herein following Tommasi) *Die ältesten römischen Sakramentarien u. Ordines*, pp. 171 f.

² Havard, *Centonisations Patristiques dans les Formules Liturgiques* (Appendix II. to Cabrol, *Origines*, &c.), pp. 133 ff.

Masses for one and the same day, is at first sight almost bewildering; and it is now commonly acknowledged that it never was an official Mass-book, but was rather in the nature of a private collection, from which prayers might be taken more or less *ad libitum*.¹ Probst, however, suggests that this multiplicity of Masses for a single feast (*e.g.* that of St. Lawrence) is to be explained by the simple hypothesis that the compiler has faithfully recorded the various local usages followed respectively in the several churches dedicated to one and the same saint.² He also gives reasons based on internal evidence, for thinking that a considerable number of the prayers preserved in the Leonianum are to be ascribed to St. Damasus (c. 375), to whom with some probability, but without any positive evidence, he attributes the introduction of variable elements—collects, prefaces, &c.—into the Roman rite.³ However this may be, there can be no doubt that many of the Leonine prayers are of great beauty and not a few of them have been preserved in the Roman Missal of to-day.⁴ The

¹ So Cabrol, *Origines*, p. 109; Fortescue, p. 118, note 5. But in fact the observation that the Leonianum is an unofficial compilation was made long ago by the brothers Ballerini in their preface to vol. ii. of the works of St. Leo (*P.L.* lv. 15 ff.), as was pointed out in *The Tablet*, 1896, ii. 1008.

² Probst, *Sakramentarien*, pp. 88 f.

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 62 ff.

⁴ For instance, the exquisitely perfect prayer (analyzed by Cabrol, pp. 110, 111) "Deus qui humanæ substantiæ," etc., used for the blessing of the water in the Offertory of the Mass.

MS. is unfortunately imperfect at the beginning and contains no text of the Canon.¹

Beyond this point it is impossible to trace the ancestry of the Roman Missal in, so to say, the direct line. Indeed, from the aforesaid characteristic features of the Leonianum, the Ballerini draw the conclusion that at the time of its compilation no official Mass-book can have been in existence, and consequently that the Gelasianum, in its original form, must have been the earliest of its kind.² Yet of what may be called collateral ancestors there are several, viz., the four or five extant early Gallican Mass-books, the conventional titles of which are given below.³ In Chapter XVI. convincing reasons, as they seem to me, will be giving for holding that the ultimate origin of the Gallican rite was Roman, and that consequently

¹ For fuller information on these three Mass-books, see the Introductions and notes in *P.L.* lv., lxxii., lxxviii., and in the standard editions of Feltoe (Leonine) and Wilson (Gelasian); Probst, *op. cit.*; Bäumer, *Das sogenannte S. Gelasianum*; E. Bishop in *Dublin Review*, *l.c.*; Cabrol, *l.c.*; Lucas in *The Tablet*, 1896, ii. 1007 ff.; 1897, i. 86 ff., ii. 204 ff.; and Fortescue, pp. 117 ff.

² *Praefatio*, &c., n. 12 (*P.L.* lv. 17 f.).

³ They are (1) the Reichenau Mass-book edited by Mone in 1853, (2) the "Missale Gothicum," (3) the "Missale Francorum," and (4) the "Sacramentarium Gallicanum," now commonly known as "the Bobbio Missal." To these may be added, as illustrating the subject, the Ambrosian, and Mozarabic, and "Stowe" (Celtic) Missals; and also the description of the Gallican and Spanish liturgies, which are in substance one, by St. Germanus of Paris and St. Isidore of Seville respectively. More particular references will be given later.

the Gallican rite, by which I mean the form of liturgy which prevailed not only in Gaul and Spain, but in Northern Italy, and possibly also in remoter Ireland, from the fourth to the seventh century, may be expected to throw light on the very obscure history of the Roman Mass in its earlier stages of development. In the meanwhile this brief statement may be sufficient to justify such references as may be made, in the intervening chapters, to Gallican sources.

CHAPTER V.

THE LITURGY: HIGH MASS AND LOW MASS: SURVIVALS AND ACCRETIONS.

FROM the foregoing considerations on the sources of the Roman liturgy, we pass now to the study of the prayers and ceremonies with which, in accordance with the prescriptions of the Church, the central act of sacrifice is, in the Roman rite, accompanied and surrounded; in other words, with the sacred liturgy as for centuries past it has been carried out, with a few local exceptions, throughout western Christendom. "For the most part," writes Mr. Edmund Bishop, "Catholics are content, where the sacred liturgy is concerned, to take in an even, not to say indifferent, spirit, the good that comes to them, without enquiring too particularly how it came. They are content in a general way with the fact that they are in the full current and stream of an uninterrupted tradition, the source of which is to be found in the apostolic age itself. Still, it should be even for Catholics a subject of interest to ascertain in some manner the steps by which the Mass-book in use to-day came to be what it is; and to trace the gradual accretions that have gathered round the primitive kernel."¹

Now it might, perhaps, be expected that, in

¹ E. Bishop, "The Earliest Roman Mass-book," in *Dublin Review*, October, 1894.

dealing with the prayers and ceremonies of the Mass as we know them, a writer should start with those parts of the liturgy which are more central, fundamental and primitive. But there may be some advantage, on the other hand, in clearing the ground by first of all dealing with certain portions and features of the Mass which are of secondary importance, and of a less venerable antiquity than the prayers which more immediately accompany and surround the essential act of sacrifice. This is what I propose to do in the present chapter.

Many of us are so thoroughly accustomed to regard "Low Mass" as the ordinary form of celebration, and to think of "High Mass" as a more or less exceptional solemnity suitable for special occasions, that it may require something of an effort to bear in mind the unquestionable fact that High Mass is the normal type, of which, so far as the non-essential ceremonies are concerned, Low Mass is a kind of abridged edition. And the nature of the abridgment may be indicated by saying that, in Low Mass, besides the omission of the chant and the incense, the functions of deacon and sub-deacon are performed by the celebrant. As an illustration of this latter may be mentioned the circumstance that, while he reads the Epistle, the celebrant, who is then acting (so to say) as sub-deacon, holds the book, just as the sub-deacon does when he chants the Epistle at a High Mass; whereas when he reads the Gospel, the celebrant keeps his hands joined, as the deacon does while the book is held for him at the chanting

of the Gospel. Moreover, as the deacon, when he sings the Gospel in a High Mass, faces the north (originally, perhaps, because it was thought right that he should face the bishop's throne), so in a Low Mass the Missal is placed, for the reading of the Gospel, slantwise upon the altar, and the celebrant stands facing as nearly northwards as the circumstances of his position conveniently permit. (The church is, of course, assumed to be correctly "orientated" with the great doors at the west end, and the altar towards the east. When this is not the case, the terms "north," "east," &c., are still retained for convenience of designation or description.) Another item in Low Mass which finds its explanation only in the fuller ceremonies of High Mass, is the position of the "Lavabo." Why should the celebrant wash his fingers just after the offering of the unconsecrated host and chalice? That the act is symbolical of the perfect purity of heart with which he should approach the sacred mysteries is perfectly true; but why is it placed precisely here? For the simple reason that, in a High Mass, the offering of the bread and wine is immediately followed by the censuring of the oblata and of the altar: and since this is a process which might easily cause some slight accidental soiling of the fingers, it is perfectly natural and congruous that, as soon as the celebrant has in his turn been censured by the deacon, he should find the acolytes ready with the water-cruet, the basin, and the towel. The censuring being omitted in a Low Mass, the "Lavabo" has nevertheless been retained,

mainly, no doubt, by reason of its symbolic significance. The need for a washing of the fingers would, of course, be more evident when "loaves and flasks of wine" were offered and received by the celebrant at this point of the service.¹ It may be of interest to note that, in the Ambrosian rite, the celebrant washes his fingers again immediately before the consecration, at the point where, in the Roman liturgy, he wipes them lightly on the corporal.

Of the preliminary portion of the Mass, which includes all that is said and done before the collect, it may be said that it consists of a number of more or less fragmentary survivals from the fuller ritual of a pontifical High Mass, or rather of the Mass as solemnly celebrated by the Pope himself in the sixth or seventh century. That our latter-day Roman Missals have been developed from an ancient Papal Mass-book is indicated, as has been said, by the titles or superscriptions "*Statio ad S. Mariam Majorem*," and the like, which stand at the head of the Masses for the Advent Sundays, for Christmas Day and the festivals which immediately follow it, for the Epiphany, Septuagesima, Sexagesima and Quinquagesima, and for each of the days of Lent, Easter Week (including Low Sunday), and Whitsun Week (not including Trinity Sunday), the Rogation days, the Ember days, Whitsun-eve, and (by reason of the litanies) St. Mark's day, April 25th. February 2nd, the feast

¹ Fortescue, p. 310.

of the Purification of our Lady, or Candlemas, was likewise a stational day, but the indication has dropped out of our modern Missals. The blessing of the candles, it should be observed, is attached to the day of the month, whereas the feast is liable to be displaced and transferred, if it should fall on a Sunday.

In the first of the "Ordines Romani" published by Mabillon, we have a graphic description of the observance of the Roman "Stations." "The curious reader," says Fr. Thurston, "may there find narrated how the assembly of the clergy and officials meets first at some church used as a *rendezvous*, where the procession is formed to set out to the station of the day. The sacred ministers are grouped around the Pope in order of due precedence, according to their special functions. The acolytes go in front, walking, but the papal deacons with their *primicerius* ride on horseback, as does the Pope himself. Immediately before him, the Apostolic sub-deacon bears a processional Cross, while at his side the *stratores* help to clear the way and keep off the crowd. The clergy of the church where the station is held come out to meet the Pope, and conduct him to the sacristy, where he is vested for Mass with the same solemnity with which the vesting of a bishop now takes place at the beginning of a pontifical function. . . Before the assembly is dismissed [at the end of Mass], a regionary subdeacon announces from the foot of the altar that on the next day that station

will be held at such and such a church, to which the choir answer: 'Thanks be to God.'"¹

The psalm "Judica me Deus," with its antiphon "Introibo ad altare Dei," though now said by the celebrant at the foot of the altar, was originally what may be described as his private "Introit"; that is to say it was the psalm which, first as a matter of laudable custom, and afterwards by rule and precept, he recited on his way from the sacristy to the altar, while the choir sang the "Introit" proper to the day. How entirely appropriate to the purpose specified is the psalm, and more particularly the antiphon, may be illustrated by a passage from the ancient tract "de Sacramentis," traditionally attributed to St. Ambrose, and perhaps compiled from his instructions. Addressing the neophytes who have just received baptism on Holy Saturday or Whitsun-eve, the writer says: "You came, then, full of desire, to the altar; you came . . . to the altar that you might thence receive the Sacrament. Let your soul exclaim: 'I will go unto the altar of God, to God Who giveth joy to my youth.' You have laid aside the decrepitude of sin,

¹ Thurston, *Lent, &c.*, pp. 155 ff. (abridged); *P.L.*, lxxviii. 937 ff. With reference to the "Ordines Romani" it may be noted here that although, in Mabillon's edition and Migne's reprint, the first four among them are arranged in chronological order, the seventh, to which reference will be made hereafter, is of earlier date than any of them. It owes its position in the series to the fact that it deals with a particular set of ceremonies, viz., those connected with the "Scrutinies," not with the normal celebration of a pontifical Mass. Cf. Probst, *Sakramentarien*, pp. 398 ff.

you have taken on the grace of youth; this is the gift which the heavenly sacraments have bestowed on you. Hear David saying: 'Thy youth shall be renewed as the eagle's,' " etc.¹

The passage only repeats, in a somewhat amplified form, what St. Ambrose himself had more briefly said in the eighth chapter of the tract "de Mysteriis."² As regards the date and provenance of the "de Sacramentis," internal evidence points to northern Italy, and to a time when Arianism was still rampant. No other heresy is alluded to, and the tract is therefore at least as old as the early part of the fifth century.³ The suggestion that the tract may have been taken down by a stenographer from the instructions of St. Ambrose himself, and destined at first, by reason of the "disciplina arcani" then in full force, for private circulation, is Probst's.⁴

The passage, however, does not, as Bona points out, either prove or indicate that either antiphon or psalm were already, in the fifth century, recited by the celebrant on his way to the altar; and we must be content to know that the usage had become thoroughly established about the time of the Norman Conquest.⁵

¹ De Sacram. IV. ii. 7 (*P.L.* xvi. 437)

² *P.L. ibid.* 403.

³ Cf. Duchesne, *Origines*, p. 169.

⁴ Probst, *Liturgie des Vierten Jahrhunderts*, p. 239.

⁵ The earliest witnesses cited by Bona (*de Rebus Liturgicis*, II. ii. 3) are a MS. of perhaps the eleventh century, and the "Micrologus," an anonymous tract of approximately the same date.

The joyful access to the altar heralded by this psalm receives, however, in the case of one who is not fresh from the waters of baptism, a check at the thought of sin; and the psalm is appropriately followed by the "Confiteor." A child's hymn gives a simple expression to the leading thoughts of both.

Now to God's altar will I go
 That He with joy may fill my youth:
 That sin's dark ways I may not know
 But walk by light of God's own truth.¹
 But I am weak and wayward, Lord,
 And from the path too oft have strayed;
 The fault is mine; Thine the reward
 Of pardon for confession made.
 With grief sincere I now confess
 My sins of thought and word and deed;
 And that I may no more transgress
 Mary and all the saints will plead.

The "Confiteor," as we know it and use it, is the result of the "survival of the fittest" among many similar forms of prayer which were composed, though no particular form was prescribed, for the use of the celebrant and the sacred ministers while they either lay prostrate (as still happens on Good Friday), or knelt or stood at the foot of the altar, while the choir continued or concluded the singing of the "Introit."² I say knelt or stood, for although Father Thurston writes: "The Good Friday prostration probably represents an act of humiliation which was as habitually practised in the early Church, as the genuflection is with us, every time

¹ "Emitte lucem tuam et veritatem tuam," etc.

² Bona, *l.c.* n. 5.

that the chief Pontiff and his attendants made their solemn entry into the sanctuary for High Mass," this seems to me to be too sweeping a statement.¹ Surely, for instance, there would be no prostration in paschal time. Nor do the words of the first "Ordo Romanus" suggest prostration as usual or habitual. "The fourth chorister precedes the pontiff, to place a cushion (or a faldstool, "oratorium") for him before the altar, and the pontiff on his arrival prays thereon (or thereat)."² This, however, is in the description of the Easter Mass. For the rest, it is but fitting that, before proceeding to the altar to plead for the people, the celebrant should first take his stand in the midst of those who represent the congregation, ranging himself for the moment with those on whose behalf he is about to offer the Holy Sacrifice.³

The "Introit," sung by the choir, and now, but not originally, recited by the celebrant at the altar, is said, in the "Liber Pontificalis," to have been introduced by Celestine I. (c. 425).⁴ It originally consisted of a complete psalm, to which the antiphon and doxology (*i.e.*, the "Gloria Patri") may have been added later. But the psalm is now

¹ Thurston, *Lent, &c.*, p. 330.

² *P.L.* lxxviii. 942.

³ On the contents and structure of the Confiteor see chapter xv.

⁴ "Hic...constituit ut cl. psalmi David ante sacrificium psallerentur antiphonatim (*i.e.*, not "with an antiphon," but by alternating choirs) quod ante non fiebat, nisi tantum recitabantur epistolae Pauli apostoli et sanctum evangelium, et sic missae fiebant" (*P.L.* cxxiii. 199 f.)

represented only by a single verse, so that this choral piece now consists of an antiphon, one verse, usually the first of a psalm, the "Gloria Patri," and the repeated antiphon—a typical instance of a fragmentary survival. It may be of interest to mention, in passing, an intermediate stage in the process of abbreviation. The psalm of the introit was, of course, sung while the Pope proceeded from the sacristy to the sanctuary. But it would often happen that he reached the sanctuary before the psalm was finished. And we learn from the "Ordo Romanus" already referred to, that when this was the case he gave a sign to the leader of the choir ("ad priorem scholae"), who thereupon sang the "Gloria Patri" without finishing the psalm.¹

The "Kyrie Eleison," as we learn from St. Gregory himself, is the abbreviated substitute for a litany which still held its place, at least on certain occasions and in penitential seasons. What the occasions were on which the litany was said, St. Gregory does not tell us, but they were plainly not of rare occurrence, for he writes: "In quotidianis autem missis aliqua *quae dici solent* tacemus, [et] tantummodo Kyrie eleison et Christe eleison dicimus."² That the litany was characteristic of penitential seasons appears from the rubric in a MS. of the Gregorianum, which directs that when it has been sung the "Gloria in excelsis" and "Alleluia" are to be omitted.³ It may be mentioned that the

¹ *P.L.* lxxviii. 942.

² *Epist.* IX. xii.; *P.L.* lxxvii. 956.

³ *P.L.* lxxviii. 25.

early Irish MS. known as the "Stowe Missal" begins, after a short antiphon, with what we now call the Litany of the Saints. But, seeing that one of the prayers which immediately follows has the colophon: "This prayer is sung at every Mass"¹ it may be inferred that the litany was not recited every day.² The litany which, in the Roman rite, was in common but not daily use, though longer than the "Kyrie," would seem to have been notably shorter than what is popularly known as "the Litany of the Saints." The official title of this is "Litaniae Majores—the Greater Litanies," a term which manifestly presupposes the existence of "lesser litanies," now no longer in use. These may probably have resembled the series of petitions, each followed by "Domine miserere—Lord have mercy" which in the Ambrosian rite are still chanted or recited on the Sundays in Lent. There is moreover some reason for thinking that the lesser litanies were—in or before St. Gregory's time—transferred from the position which, as Probst believed, they

¹ MacCarthy, p. 195.

² It has repeatedly been observed (by Warren, MacCarthy, and others) that a fragmentary MS. of the Irish Abbey of St. Gall (one of St. Colombanus' continental foundations) begins, like the Stowe Missal, with the antiphon "Peccavimus," etc., which in the latter precedes the litany. But the very remarkable similarity even in strange details of the initial P in the two MSS., has not, I believe, been noticed in any work on the subject; and I take the opportunity of calling attention to it here. The point of this observation is that from the close similarity of the MSS., so far as they admit of comparison, we should learn not to regard the Stowe Missal as an altogether isolated witness in liturgical matters.

formerly held after the Gospel. The greater litanies were, on the other hand, of a processional character. These latter still hold their place on Holy Saturday and on Whitsun-eve, on which days the final "Kyrie" of the litany serves as the "Kyrie" of the Mass.¹ The same may perhaps have been formerly the case on the Rogation days and on March 25th, on which days the "Litaniae majores" are also prescribed.²

The "Gloria in excelsis" is the Latin version of a Greek hymn which, in the Byzantine rite, forms part of the morning office ("Orthros," corresponding to our "Lauds"), but not of the Mass.³ According to the "Liber Pontificalis" it was St. Telesphorus (c. 130) who first ordered that the "Gloria" should be sung at the midnight Mass of Christmas Day.⁴ But this statement may probably have reference only to the opening words of the hymn, which is said, but on doubtful authority, to have been first translated in its entirety by St. Hilary of Poitiers (c. 350). Bona cites St. Athan-

¹ This is true, of course, only of the principal Mass on Whitsun Eve, when it follows the blessing of the font.

² Cf. Probst, *Abendländische Messe*, pp. 123 ff., and (not quite in accord with him) Thurston, *Lent and Holy Week*, pp. 434 f.

³ Brightman, *Eastern Liturgies*, p. 577 (s.v. "Gloria").

⁴ "Hic constituit ut . . . natali Domini noctu missae celebrarentur (here we have the very origin of the midnight Mass) . . . et ante sacrificium hymnus diceretur angelicus, hoc est, *Gloria in excelsis Deo*" (L.P. in P.L. cxxvii. 1175 f.). No indication is here given of the position of the "Gloria" in the Mass. This is doubtful by reason of the statement in the "L.P." that down to Celestine's time the liturgy began with the lessons.

asius for its use as a morning hymn, and observes that Alcuin (c. 800) is the first to mention the tradition concerning St. Hilary.¹ By Pope Symmachus (c. 500) if we may trust the "*Liber Pontificalis*," its use was extended to all Sundays and to the feasts of Martyrs.² With the exception, however, of Easter-day, it was to be sung only when the celebrant was a bishop; and this prohibition lasted during many centuries.³ Berno of Reichenau, in his treatise "*de Officio Missae*" (c. 1030) argues at great length that there is no reason why priests as well as bishops should not recite this hymn at Mass.⁴ And although Ménard and Bona, commenting on the passage,⁵ very pertinently remark that the quite explicit regulation on the subject ought to have been accounted a good and sufficient reason for abstention, we may well rejoice that the pious importunity of private devotion—tolerated as we must suppose by a not too-exacting authority—should have at last carried the day, and that we are not only allowed, but commanded, to recite the "*Gloria*" in every festal Mass.

¹ Bona, II. iv. He aptly justifies the use of the word "hymn" to describe the Gloria by quoting the words of St. Augustine (in Ps. cxlviii.): "*Si laudas Deum et non cantas, non dicis hymnum. Si laudes quod non pertinet ad laudem Dei, non dicis hymnum. Hymnum ergo tria ista habet, et canticum, et laudem, et Dei.*"

² *P.L.* cxxviii. 453 f.

³ So Ménard's MS. of the Gregorianum: "*Item dicitur, Gloria (&c.) . . . si episcopus fuerit, tantummodo die dominico sive diebus festis. A presbyteris autem minime dicitur, nisi solo in Pascha*" (*P.L.* lxxviii. 25).

⁴ *P.L.* cxlii. 1058 f.

⁵ Ménard (note 9) in *P.L.* lxxviii. 268; Bona, *l.c.*

And here a remark and a digression may be allowed which may possibly help devotion. While it is a most excellent "method of hearing Mass" to follow the celebrant verbatim throughout the service with the help of the Missal, this particular "method" has at no time been prescribed to the laity. And even were it only by way of an occasional change, it may be useful sometimes to fix the attention on particular words or phrases and to dwell upon them for a while, developing and expanding them in our thoughts, after the fashion of St. Ignatius Loyola's "second method of prayer, without feeling bound to "hurry on" so as to keep pace with the priest at the altar. Among many words and phrases which thus lend themselves to expansive and affective reflection are those of the Gloria: "We praise Thee, we bless Thee, we glorify Thee, we give Thee thanks," &c., which do, indeed, strike the very key-note of the Eucharistic liturgy. Here is a simple expansion of these words in the form of a child's hymn or rhymed prayer (it makes no claim to be regarded as poetry).

AN ACT OF PRAISE AND THANKSGIVING.

All glory be to God on high !
We praise Thee, bless Thee, glorify
Thy name, and thank Thee, dearest Lord,
For all Thy gifts on us outpoured.
Ungrateful may we never be,
Forgetful of our debt to Thee.

We thank Thee for Thy lowly birth,
We thank Thee for Thy life on earth ;
We thank Thee for Thy words and deeds,
So full of comfort for our needs.

We thank Thee for Thy passion too,
 Wherewith our hard hearts Thou wouldst woo ;
 Thy sweat of blood, the scourging sore
 That for our sins Thy body tore ;
 We thank Thee for Thy thorny crown,
 And for the Cross that bore Thee down
 Upon the road to Calvary,
 And for Thy death upon that tree ;
 Lord, Thou didst bear it all for me.
 And lest Thy love we should forget,
 Another boon Thou addest yet,
 Of all the best, Thy Flesh and Blood,
 To be our soul's enduring food.
 O wondrous gift ! O love supreme,
 Surpassing every thought or dream
 Of man's dull heart ! But Thou hast said :
 " Take ye, and eat, in form of bread,
 And drink the blood for sinners shed."
 All glory be to God on high !
 We praise Thee, bless Thee, glorify
 Thy name, and thank Thee, dearest Lord,
 For all Thy gifts on us outpoured.

Passing now from the preliminary to the concluding portion of the Mass as we know it, we shall find that the " Gloria " is not the only instance in which what was originally a kind of usurpation, prompted by private devotion, has come to have the force of law. As we all know, immediately after the postcommunion and the salutation, " Dominus vobiscum," with its response, the deacon sings: " *Ite, missa est,*" *i.e.*, " Go, you are dismissed," or, more literally, " Go, it is the dismissal." And yet, if we are well-conducted Christians, we don't go, but stay in our places. We wait for the blessing, and for the " last Gospel." These are plainly

in the nature of supplementary accretions super-added to an earlier and simpler "use." And this fact accounts, likewise, for the apparently incongruous arrangement by which "Ite, missa est" has an elaborate musical setting, whereas, unless the celebrant be a bishop, the blessing is not chanted at all. It will readily be understood that we have here the survival of a period during which none but a bishop was allowed to give the blessing at the end of Mass; and Dr. Fortescue is probably right when he finds the origin of the blessing, as given in non-pontifical functions, in that which bishops usually give as they pass the congregation on their way from the altar after any service.¹ But in fact the story of episcopal blessings at or towards the end of Mass is rather complicated; and both for brevity's sake and because it is of no living interest it may well be omitted here.²

In the Lenten Masses and on certain other occasions, as we all know, the dismissal is replaced by the words, "Benedicamus Domino," which may be construed as an invitation to stay for Vespers, as many of us, very laudably, do stay, when, on

¹ Fortescue, p. 393. The *Micrologus* calls in question the existence, at any time, of such a prohibition as has been mentioned above. At any rate, he says in effect, if it was ever in force, it had already in his time been completely over-ridden by a custom so well established that any departure from it would be a scandal (*P.L.* &c. 990 ff.).

² The confusion introduced into the subject by Ménard (note 100, in *P.L.* lxxviii. 286 ff.) was long since cleared up by Bona, II. xvi., a point which deserves to be borne in mind by students of an otherwise excellent commentary on the Gregorianum.

Maundy Thursday and Good Friday, Vespers are chorally recited immediately after the Mass. And the "Oratio super populum," which forms a distinctive feature of the ferial Masses in Lent is, I am inclined to think, closely connected with the combination of a late Mass with early Vespers during the penitential season. For the "Oratio super populum" is no other than the prayer proper to the Vespers of the day; and its introduction here may well have been by way of an abbreviated substitute for Vespers, for the benefit of those, and they would be many, who could not remain for that service. The reader will also remember the shortened Vespers of Holy Saturday, which are incorporated in the liturgy of the Mass for that day. Father Thurston's suggestion, to the effect that the "Oratio super populum" was specifically a prayer for those of the faithful who had not communicated, is, as it seems to me, of doubtful value, though it had been already made by the author of the *Micrologus* nearly nine hundred years ago, and is cited with approval by Bona.¹ Against it may be cited not only the "oratio super populum" proper to Ash Wednesday ("ut qui divino munere sunt refecti, caelestibus . . . nutriantur auxiliis") which quite plainly and unmistakably implies that those on whose behalf it is said have, in fact, received Holy Communion, but also several of the corresponding prayers in the *Gelasianum*. Thus on two successive pages of Wilson's edition may be found the following phrases, occurring in *lenten*

¹ Thurston, *Lent, &c.*, p. 190; *P.L.* cli. 1014; Bona, *l.c.*

prayers "super populum," viz. (1) "plebem . . . quam divinis tribuis proficere sacramentis"; (2) "caeleste munus quod frequentant"; (3) "plebs tua benedictionis sanctae munus accipiat"; and again a little later, (4) "populis qui sacra mysteria contigerunt."¹ It seems hardly possible to understand these expressions either of presence at Holy Mass or of the penitential ordinances proper to the season.

The "last Gospel," which normally consists of St. John's sublime prologue: "In the beginning was the Word," &c., owes its place in the liturgy to a devout practice of reciting this passage on the way from the altar to the sacristy. By a custom, long since legalized, but of relatively late introduction, when a festal Mass displaces that of a Sunday or "feria," the Gospel of the Sunday or ferial Mass is read as the last Gospel. This is at least the case in private Masses. In cathedrals and monastic or collegiate churches where the ritual can be fully carried out, two solemn Masses are celebrated, one of the Sunday or feria, and one of the feast.

It has already been implied that, etymologically speaking, the word "Mass" means, simply, "dismissal." The form "missa," for "missio," is analogous to other low-Latin words, having the same termination, which are to be found in liturgical documents. Such are "ingressa," the Mozarabic name of the introit, for "ingressio," "collecta" for "collectio" ("collectio" being

¹ Wilson, *The Gelasian Sacramentary*, pp. 19, 40.

the form used in the old Gallican Mass-books), "ascensa" for "ascensio," and so forth. The phrase "missarum (not "missae") solemnity" had reference originally, to the two-fold dismissal (1) of the catechumens, and in some cases of the penitents, either before or after the Gospel or the homily, and (2) of the faithful at the end of the service.¹ It may seem strange, but it is unquestionably true, that from these solemn acts of dismissal the liturgy of the Mass, as a whole, has taken its name. By a similar extension of meaning the term is used in the "Peregrinatio Silviae" to designate other services also.

¹ The point at which the catechumens were dismissed was not always everywhere the same, as will be seen later. See below, chapter viii.

CHAPTER VI.

THE COLLECT, SECRETA AND POSTCOMMUNION.

OF the three main divisions of the Mass, doctrinal, sacrificial and sacramental respectively, of which something was said in an earlier chapter, each contains a variable prayer, or short series of such variable prayers, assigned to the particular day on which the Mass is celebrated, or, to speak more accurately, assigned to the Mass itself, which may happen to be a "votive" Mass.

The three variable prayers are, of course, the Collect, the Secreta and the Postcommunion. And although our immediate concern is with the first of these only, they have so much in common that they may be conveniently dealt with together.

The word "collect" ("collecta"="collectio"="synaxis") originally meant no more than "an assembly" or even "a crowd," as when the capitularies of Charlemagne decree penalties against those who, on certain occasions raise an armed mob ("si quis cum . . . cum collecta et armis venerit").¹ And its earliest ecclesiastical use was similar to this, except that it signified, of course, an assembly or gathering for religious purposes. This meaning it continued to bear even down to the seventh century; for in several MSS. of the Gregorianum, under date, February 2nd (iv. nonas

¹ Caroli Magni *Capit.* iii. 74, *apud* Bona, II. v. 9.

Feb.), we find the title "Oratio ad collectam ad S. Adrianum," and presently "Ad missam ad S. Mar. Majorem," which implies, of course, that the congregation assembled at St. Adrian's, and thence went in procession to St. Mary Major, where the Mass was celebrated.¹ From the full form, "oratio ad collectam," to the shorter and simpler "collecta," the transition was easy and obvious, and thus we get the meaning "a prayer recited (or chanted) on the assembly of the congregation." It next lost this more special significance, and, in the Western Church came to signify any liturgical prayer of the same general type as those which served as "collects" in the more restricted sense. Thus, in the early Gallican Mass-books, the title "collectio" is given to a number of variable prayers occurring at various points of the Mass, *e.g.*, "collectio ad nomina," "collectio ad pacem," &c. In the Roman liturgy, however, the term "collect" is exclusively applied to those variable prayers which are chanted or recited before the Epistle, though these prayers often retain their name even when they are used on other occasions. Nor should a secondary and adventitious meaning of the term be overlooked. The mediæval writers on the liturgy tell us that the "collect" is so called because, in it, the celebrant "gathers up" into a compendious expression the silent prayer and petitions of all who are present.²

On a majority of feast-days only one collect is

¹ *P.L.* lxxviii. 46.

² Bona, *l.c.*; Probst, *Abendl. Messe*, p. 126.

said, but the number may be increased by one or more "commemorations," when these are prescribed by the rubrics, or by an "*oratio imperata*," *i.e.*, a prayer added by order of the Bishop. Moreover, as a rule, ferial Masses (*i.e.*, Masses proper to particular week-days) have at least three collects, exclusive of the "*imperata*." The next point to be noticed is that whatever the number of collects may be, that of the *secretæ* and post-communions is the same; or, in other words, that each collect has its corresponding *secretæ* and post-communion. Of the subsidiary collects which are said or sung when one or more lessons from Holy Scripture, in addition to the Epistle and Gospel, are read, something will be said in Chapter VII.

These variable prayers, proper to particular days or particular Masses, and all conforming to a certain structural type to be presently described, are characteristic of the Western liturgies, as distinct from the Eastern, which have nothing that corresponds to them in point of form and variability. And they undoubtedly deserve serious study. A "liberal" education is supposed to impart at least some appreciation of the beauties of classical Latin; but it is well to remember that ecclesiastical Latin has its beauties also, and that these are nowhere more apparent than in the collects, *secretæ*, and postcommunions of the Roman Missal.

While these three classes of prayers have, as has been said above, certain general features in common, there are others which are severally characteristic of each class. To take the latter first,

a very cursory examination of the Missal is sufficient to reveal the fact that whereas the collect is of more general import, the secreta almost invariably (and in the case of the older Masses quite invariably) contains a special reference to the Sacrifice ("haec munera," or "dona," or "sacrificia," "has hostias," or the like), while the postcommunion no less invariably has reference to the Sacrament, which, be it observed, all those who have been present at Mass are assumed to have received. By way of illustration it may be useful to cite the secreta and postcommunion of the Mass for the Wednesday in the third week of Lent.

S.—"Suscipe, quaesumus Domine, preces populi tui *cum oblationibus hostiarum*: et tua mysteria celebrantes ab omnibus nos defende periculis. Per Dominum," &c. ("Receive, we beseech Thee, O Lord, the prayers of Thy people, *together with the sacrificial gifts* which we offer," &c.)

P.C.—"Sanctificet nos, Domine, *qua pastisumus mensa caelestis*: et a cunctis erroribus expiatis, promissionibus reddat acceptos. Per Dominum," &c. ("May *the heavenly banquet wherewith we have been refreshed* sanctify us, O Lord," &c.).

It is nothing short of a liturgical solecism when, in certain Masses compiled in comparatively modern times, the secreta contains no reference whatever to the sacrifice as such, but is concerned solely with the Communion. The re-awakened or re-awakening liturgical sense of our own times will, it may be hoped, preserve the venerable Mis-

sale Romanum from any additional blots and blunders of this kind.

To return now to the general characteristics which are common to all these variable prayers, it will be profitable to consider carefully the structural type to which they all, more or less perfectly, conform. Every one of these prayers will be found to contain all or some of the following elements, and, for the most part, no others, viz.:

(1) The invocation: "Deus," "Omnipotens sempiterne Deus," "Domine," or the like. ("O God," "Almighty and everlasting God," "O Lord," &c.)¹

(2) The "motive," very commonly, but not invariably, introduced by the relative "qui," ("who,"): *e.g.*, "Deus, *qui corda fidelium Sancti Spiritus illustratione docuisti*" ("O God, *who hast taught the hearts of Thy faithful by the light of the Holy Spirit*"); or, "Deus, *cujus proprium est misereri semper et parcere*" ("O God, *whose property it is always to show mercy and to spare*"). Or again to take a couple of examples from Masses proper to Saints' days: "Deus *qui praesentem diem honorabilem nobis in beati Joannis nativitate fecisti*" ("O God, *who hast made this day honourable for us by the birth of blessed John*," *i.e.*, the Baptist); "Deus *qui hodiernam diem*

¹ Dr. Fortescue (pp. 249 ff.) gives an analysis of the typical collect which in some details differs from the above; but I see no reason for modifying what was already in print a year or more before the publication of his book (*viz.*, in *The Xaverian*, 1909).

apostolorum tuorum Petri et Pauli martyrio consecrasti” (“O God, who hast hallowed this day by the martyrdom of Thy Apostles Peter and Paul”), &c. Sometimes the “motive” is expressed by means of an appellative or adjectival clause, or by a word or phrase “in apposition”; and in the former case, as is obvious, “invocation” and “motive” are or may be in a manner fused into one. *E.g.*, (a) “Deus, *infirmittatis humanae singulare praesidium*” (“O God (who art) the support of human weakness”); (b) “Omnipotens sempiterne Deus, *salus aeterna credentium*” (Almighty and everlasting God (who art) the everlasting salvation of them that believe,” &c. In a large number of instances, however, the “invocation” stands alone, without the addition of any specific “motive” for confidence.

(3) The “petition.” This is so obviously the very centre and substance of the prayer that it can never be lacking, and it hardly calls for illustration by examples, except indeed for the sake of completeness, and also for the sake of indicating the solemn simplicity and sobriety of language which marks these strictly liturgical prayers. Here are a few specimens:—

“Exaudi nos pro famulis tuis infirmis, pro quibus misericordiae tuae imploramus auxilium.” (“Graciously hear our prayers for Thy servants who are sick, for whom we implore the aid of Thy mercy.”)

“Da Ecclesiae tuae, eorum in omnibus sequi praeceptum, per quos religionis sumpsit exordium.”

("Grant that Thy Church may in all things follow their precepts from whom it derived its first beginnings," *i.e.*, the Holy Apostles.)

(More briefly) "Fidelibus tuis perpetuam concede laetitiam." ("Grant to Thy faithful an unbroken gladness,") &c.

(4) The "petition" is commonly, though by no means universally, enforced by the expression of a "purpose." It may be explained that, roughly speaking, the "motive" has special reference to God, being an appeal to Him in consideration of one or other of His attributes or acts, whereas the "purpose" has reference, more especially, to the needs of the petitioners. *E.g.*, to take first the instance last quoted, the "petition" and the "purpose" are thus expressed, the particle "ut" (—"in order that") introducing the latter:—

"Fidelibus tuis perpetuam concede laetitiam; *ut* quos perpetuae mortis eripuisti casibus, gaudiis facias perfrui sempiternis." ("Grant to Thy faithful an unbroken gladness, *that* Thou mayest make them to enjoy eternal bliss whom Thou hast rescued from the perils of everlasting death.") Here, be it observed, much of the force of the Latin is lost by the unavoidable transposition of the clauses. This, however, is only one out of innumerable instances in which the terse elegance of the original refuses to lend itself to the exigencies of translation. Moral: All who can do so should by all means learn to use, and to love, the Missale Romanum, and not to be content with any poor, weak-kneed English substitute.

It should be added that, occasionally, the place of the "purpose" is taken by a secondary petition, and likewise that the petition itself sometimes takes, grammatically, the form of a "purpose," introduced by some such formula as "da, quaesumus, *ut*" ("grant, we beseech Thee, *that*"), &c. But on these departures from the normal type it is not necessary here to dwell.

(5) Last of all, and apart from the body of the prayer, comes the "conclusion," of which the most usual form is "Per Dominum nostrum Jesum Christum qui tecum vivit et regnat, in unitate Spiritus Sancti, Deus, per omnia saecula saeculorum." Sometimes, however, the contents of the prayer require a somewhat different ending, *e.g.*, "Per *eundem* Dominum," or, "Qui tecum vivit et et regnat," where our Lord has been already mentioned, or again " . . . in unitate *eiusdem* Spiritus Sancti . . . ," when mention has been made of the Holy Spirit, and so forth. The immense majority of collects and of secretae and post-communions are addressed, as the student of the Missal will readily see, to God the Father. But, in accordance with our Lord's own precept, all such prayers are addressed to the Father "through Jesus Christ our Lord," and, in accordance with a venerable liturgical usage, the unity of the Three Divine Persons in the Blessed Trinity is always explicitly affirmed in prayers of this class. When, however, a series of collects is prescribed, the "conclusion" is attached only to the first and last of them; and when a collect is used "extra-litur-

gically," *i.e.*, otherwise than in the Mass or the Divine Office, the "short conclusion" ("through Christ our Lord") is used.

Those who pay intelligent attention to the liturgical chant at High Mass, and in particular to the chant of the celebrant, will easily be able to discover for themselves that the intonations used in the singing of the collect and the postcommunion serve, as a rule, to mark off two at least of the main divisions indicated above. Two inflections, a greater and a lesser, occur in the body of the prayer, the greater for the most part coming at the close of the "motive," while the lesser concludes the "petition" and introduces the "purpose" of the prayer. When these prayers are correctly printed, as in the authentic "*Missale Romanum*," the place of the inflexions is indicated by a colon "punctum principale" and a semi-colon "semi-punctum" respectively. These stops, it will be observed, indicate, not precisely "breaks in the sense" (as Haberl incorrectly says), but rather the logical divisions of the sentence, which is not quite the same thing. The following example may serve to illustrate this, the syllables on which the inflexions fall being indicated by italics and hyphens:

"Deus, qui omnipotentiam tuam parcendo maxime et miserando *ma-ni-fe-stas*: multiplica super nos misericordiam *tu-am*; ut," &c.

It will have been noticed that whereas the collect is usually introduced by the single word "*Oremus*," the series of collects which, on Good Friday,

follow the Gospel, are each introduced by an introductory formula, in which we are invited to pray for the special intentions for which the several prayers are offered. That such invitatory formulæ were in daily use in the Gallican liturgy will be shown hereafter, viz., in Chapter XVI. Whether this was ever the case in the Roman liturgy, except in the case of the "orationes solemnes" above referred to, is doubtful. Such formulæ are indeed found in the ordinal of the Gelasian Sacramentary, but inasmuch as this book, in the form in which it has come down to us, shows unmistakable traces of Gallican influence, no certain argument as to the Roman use can be drawn from its testimony. Moreover, it would in any case be unsafe to argue from a very special ceremonial, like that of ordination, to a common use of such invitatories. Yet though the fact seems to have been overlooked by many writers, one such formula (fixed, not variable) is actually to be found in the Ordinary of the Mass, and is never omitted. I refer to the "Orate fratres," which daily serves to introduce the secreta. And since the secreta was and is thus prefaced, it is at least possible that the collect and the postcommunion may likewise have had, in the fourth century or earlier, their variable or fixed invitatories. It should also be noted that another somewhat analogous formula has survived in the words: "Praeceptis salutaribus moniti," which immediately precedes the "Pater noster."

Returning for a moment to the Good Friday

collects, it will be remembered that, after the celebrant has chanted the invitatory, the deacon, with the words: "Flectamus genua," bids us all kneel down, after which, almost as though the deacon had made a mistake, the subdeacon sings "Levate," telling us to rise from our knees. The deacon, however, has made no mistake. What has happened is simply this, that whereas his summons to kneel down was originally followed by an interval of silent prayer, this interval—as a concession to human weakness—was gradually curtailed till the act of kneeling became, what it is now, a simple genuflection. "Flectamus genua," etc., is still said on the Wednesdays and Saturdays in the Ember weeks of Advent, Lent, and September, and in the morning office of Holy Saturday. There can, I think, be little doubt that the invitatory was originally sung by the deacon; and it is at least certain that it was the deacon who originally sang "Levate." Its transference to the sub-deacon may well have been occasioned by a desire to minimize the apparent incongruity to which attention is called above. Yet as a warning against hasty conclusions, it may be worth while to observe that the liturgy of the Coptic Jacobites has a triple genuflection without any pause, the invitatory to "bend the knee" being thrice repeated.¹

In conclusion, space may be found for a few specimens of complete collects, which may serve to illustrate not only the structural analysis that has been given above, but also some at least of

¹ Brightman, *Eastern Liturgies*, p. 159.

the beauties of these altogether admirable prayers. The first three are taken from the "Proprium de tempore,"- and the last from the collection of "Orationes ad diversa" (prayers for special occasions) which may be found in the Missal immediately after the votive Masses and the Nuptial Mass, and which are too often overlooked altogether.

(*Eleventh Sunday after Pentecost.*) "Omnipotens sempiterne Deus (invocation), qui abundantia pietatis tuæ et merita supplicum excedis et vota (motive): effunde super nos misericordiam tuam (petition); ut dimittas quæ conscientia metuit, et adjicias quod oratio non præsumit" (purpose). ("Almighty and everlasting God, who out of the abundance of Thy loving-kindness dost surpass alike the deserts of Thy suppliants and their desires: pour out Thy mercy upon us; so that Thou mayest pardon what conscience gives us reason to fear, and mayest grant in addition what in our prayers we dare not to claim at Thy hands.

(*Fourth Sunday after Easter.*) "Deus, qui fidelium mentes unius efficis voluntatis: da populis tuis id amare quod præcipis, id desiderare quod promittis; ut inter mundanas varietates ibi nostra fixa sint corda, ubi vera sunt gaudia." ("O God, who dost make Thy faithful to be of one mind and will: grant to Thy people to love what Thou commandest and to desire what Thou has promised; that our hearts may there be fixed, where true joy is found.")

(*Fifth Sunday after Easter.*) "Deus, a quo bona cuncta procedunt, largire supplicibus tuis:

ut cogitemus, te inspirante, quae recta sunt, et te gubernante, eadem faciamus." ("O God, from whom all good things proceed, grant to Thy suppliants that by Thy inspiration we may think of what is right, and that under Thy guidance we may do the same.") Could any petition be more simple and comprehensive or, in the original Latin, more forcibly expressed? It will be noted that here, by reason of the shortness of the prayer, the "punctum principale" is shifted forward to the usual place of the "semi-punctum," and the latter is omitted altogether.

(*For the grace of humility.*) "Deus, qui superbis resistis, et gratiam praestas humilibus: concede nobis verae humilitatis virtutem, cujus in se formam fidelibus Unigenitus tuus exhibuit; ut nunquam indignationem tuam provocemus elati, sed potius gratiae tuae capiamus dona subjecti." ("O God, who dost resist the proud, and givest grace to the humble: grant us the virtue of true humility, whereof Thine Only-begotten Son showed in Himself an example to Thy faithful; that we may never be so puffed up as to provoke Thine indignation, but that rather by submission to Thy will we may become the recipients of Thy gifts.")

In this chapter the position of the collect, as the first item in the Mass of the Catechumens, has been taken for granted. Sundry questions relative to its original position, and to the mutual relations of the variable prayers occurring in the several Western liturgies, may be more conveniently dealt with in subsequent chapters.

CHAPTER VII.

THE LESSONS FROM HOLY SCRIPTURE.

THE first of the three chief divisions of the Mass, apart from preliminaries and supplementary accretions, consists in the main, as has been said, in the chanting or reading of certain passages from Holy Scripture. To them, all else in this part of the liturgy is subsidiary. These lessons from Holy Scripture are nowadays commonly and popularly spoken of as "the Epistle and Gospel"; and the phrase represents, with sufficient accuracy, the more ordinary usage of our time. Anyone, however, who is in the habit of using the Missal will have noticed that the first lesson, even when there are only two, is sometimes taken, not from the Epistles, but either from the Old Testament or from the Acts of the Apostles or from the Apocalypse. He may further have observed that on the Wednesdays in the four Ember-weeks, as well as in the fourth week of Lent and in Holy Week, three lessons are read, one from the Old Testament, one from the Apostolic writings, and (of course) one from the Gospels; that the Mass proper to the Ember Saturdays has six lessons (the number was originally twelve) besides the Gospel; and that on Holy Saturday, as part of the baptismal service, twelve lessons, called "prophecies," are read in addition to the Epistle and the Gospel, and six on Whitsun-eve. It is plain from the sermons of

St. Augustine that in his day, and in Africa, sometimes only two lessons were read. Thus: "Primam lectionem audivimus apostoli; 'Fidelis sermo,' etc. . . . deinde cantavimus psalmum'. . . . post haec evangelica lectio decem leprosos . . . ostendit." And again: "Prima lectio . . . hodie . . . est apostoli facta." Sometimes, however, there were three or more. Thus: "In omnibus lectionibus quas recitatas audivimus . . . primam . . . Isaiae prophetae, quia omnia quae lecta sunt nec meminisse nec dicere possumus."¹ According to the "Liber Pontificalis," the practice of reading two lessons only, *i.e.*, the Epistle and the Gospel, was already well-established in Rome, in the earlier years of the fifth century. For, as has been seen above, Celestine I. is there said to have introduced psalmody before the lessons, which, apart from special occasions, are distinctly said to have been two only. Yet there is reason to believe that at an earlier period the usual number, outside of Paschal time, was three. For the Gallican rite, derived originally from Rome, ordinarily had three lessons; the Mozarabic usually three; and the Ambrosian rite retains the three lessons on Sundays and all greater feasts. Moreover internal evidence seems to point in the same direction. The Bobbio Missal has three lessons on the first Sunday in Advent, on Christmas Day, on the first Sunday in Lent, in the "Missa in Symboli traditione," on Easter Sunday and in Paschal time (from Apocalypse, Acts, and Gospel of St.

¹ *P.L.* xxxviii. 950, 962, 262. Cf. Fortescue, p. 256.

John), and in many instances under the heading: "Incipiunt lectiones cottidianis," (*sic.*).¹ Moreover it will be noticed that except in Paschal time, the Epistle is immediately followed, not only by the "gradual," but also by a second antiphon introduced and concluded by the word or phrase, "Alleluia," or, in Lent and on certain other occasions, by the "tract." Now when two lessons are read before the Gospel, the first is followed by the gradual, the second by the tract, or, in Whitsun-week, by the "Alleluia" antiphon; which at least suggests that the duplicated psalmody points to a "dropped" lesson.² Unfortunately, however, for the peace of mind of "conjectural reconstructionists," the argument loses its force if we accept at its face value the statement of the "Liber Pontificalis," not only that Celestine introduced the singing of a psalm at the introit, but also that down to his time there was no psalmody at all "ante sacrificium"; which might be taken to imply that not the introit only, but also the gradual and Alleluia antiphon were added to the more primitive rite, after the lessons had already been reduced to two only; assuming that

¹ *P.L.* lxxii. 451 ff. So too St. Germanus: "Lectio prophetica suum tenet ordinem . . . Quod enim propheta clamat futurum, apostolus docet factum. *Actus autem apostolorum vel Apocalypsis Joannis pro novitate gaudii paschalis leguntur.*" (Germanus, *Epist.* i. *ibid.* 90).

² Duchesne was, I think, the first to call attention to this point. The compiler of the Stowe Missal designates the duplicated psalmody by the odd title "Psalmus bigradualis" (so in Probst's reprint, *Abendl. Messe*, p. 46, but not in MacCarthy, p. 199).

there once were three. But it is permissible to doubt whether the eighth century compiler of the "*Liber Pontificalis*" has rightly understood his authority, and whether he has not erred in ascribing to Celestine anything beyond the introduction of the "*psalmus ad introitum*"; or whether again, by "*ante sacrificium*," he really means anything more than "*at the commencement of the liturgy*."¹

That the reading of the Gospel is surrounded with a more elaborate ceremonial than that of the Epistle is evident to anyone who has been present at High Mass. After the deacon has recited the "*Munda cor meum—Cleanse my heart and my lips O Lord*," and has received the blessing of the celebrant, a little procession is formed, consisting of the master of ceremonies and the thurifer with the incense, the acolytes with their candles, the subdeacon, and lastly the deacon who is to sing the Gospel. The announcement of the Gospel ("*Lectio Sancti Evangelii*," &c.) is greeted with the response, "*Gloria tibi, Domine*," and while this is being sung the book is censed. The "*tone*" of the Gospel is, too, more solemn than that of the Epistle, and at its conclusion, the book is carried by the subdeacon to the celebrant, who kisses the open page. Still more striking is the solemnity when, as in the Cathedral at Milan and in two or three of the more ancient churches in Rome, the Gospel is sung from an ambo or pulpit. All this special honour paid to the Gospel is manifestly in accordance with the fitness of things. But the

¹ The passage has been quoted above, p. 54 (note 4).

Epistle also has its distinctive though minor solemnity. It is chanted by the subdeacon; whereas the other lessons, when there were more than two in all, were probably read, not by the subdeacon, but by "lectors," the very *raison d'être* of whose office was to perform this function. Dr. Fortescue, however, writes: "It was not originally the privilege of the subdeacon to read it," *i.e.*, the Epistle. "At first all lessons (including the Gospel) were read by lectors . . . In the West as late as the fifth century the lessons were still chanted by readers. Gradually the subdeacon obtained the right to sing the Epistle as a consequence of the deacon's privilege of singing the Gospel." The number of sacred ministers had been reduced to two, so also had the usual number of lessons, "one minister sang the Gospel, it seemed natural that the other should sing the Epistle."¹ To this day the first lesson on Good Friday is read by a "lector," the second by the subdeacon; and the "prophecies" on Holy Saturday and Whitsun-eve are likewise read by clerics representing the "lectores" of earlier days.²

It may here be mentioned in passing that the gradual too was in pre-Gregorian days sung by the deacon. St. Gregory himself somewhere relates that this arrangement was apt to lead to an abuse, as deacons were apt to be chosen for their vocal powers. Accordingly the duty of singing the

¹ Fortescue, p. 263, citing Reuter, *Das Subdiaconat*, pp. 177—185.

² Probst, *Abendl. Messe*, p. 108.

gradual was transferred to cantors, who, for the purpose, could not be allowed to mount higher than the steps of the ambo. Hence the name "gradual."

As regards the choice of the passages to be read in each Mass, there can be little doubt that originally the Epistles and the Gospels were read continuously from the text of the New Testament, or rather of its parts, and that the words "Deo gratias" and "Laus tibi, Christe," which are now said by the server or assistants at the conclusion of the Epistle and Gospel respectively, are survivals of the sign originally given by the celebrant that the reading should cease. "The memoirs of the apostles or the writings of the prophets are read, as far as time permits," says St. Justin (c. 150).¹ And the giving of a sign to cease reading finds it parallel in the similar directions, occurring in the Roman ordines, that the celebrant is to signify that the singing of the psalm at the introit, or of the Kyrie, is to be brought to a close. In this connection it may be observed that down to the present day it happens on certain occasions that the reading in a community refectory is brought to an end by means of the ancient formula "Deo gratias," the use of which for such a purpose probably comes down by unbroken tradition from quite primitive times.

It is, however, almost certain that already in the fourth century the practice of reading the

¹ Apol. I. lxvii. 3. "Lectio igitur erat continua neque fiebat per pericopas." (Rauschen, *ad loc.*)

sacred text continuously had begun to give place to a system, or rather to sundry systems which varied locally, of fixed "pericopae," *i.e.*, to the assignment of particular passages to particular days or Masses. And it can hardly be doubted that the lectionary ("Liber Epistolarum et Evangeliorum"), in actual use is due to a partial fusion of several such systems. It is obvious that the Epistles and Gospels assigned to certain particular feasts and seasons, as for example, Christmas, Epiphany, Easter, Ascension Day, Pentecost, Advent, Lent, the Ember-days and Saints' days, have been chosen as specially appropriate to the occasion. But in the case of the Sundays after Pentecost, and of the third, fourth, fifth and sixth after Epiphany, *i.e.*, of rather more than half the Sundays of the year, it is impossible to discover any such special appropriateness. On the other hand, in the case of these very Sundays, traces are still visible, at least, as regards the Epistles, of the primitive method of continuous or successive readings. Thus the Epistles for the fourth, sixth, seventh and eighth Sundays after Pentecost are from Romans, for the ninth, tenth and eleventh from First Corinthians, for the twelfth from Second Corinthians, for the thirteenth, fourteenth and fifteenth from Galatians, for the sixteenth, seventeenth, nineteenth, twentieth and twenty-first from Ephesians, for the twenty-second and twenty-third from Philippians, and for the twenty-fourth from Colossians. The Epistle for the eighteenth Sunday is an exception, probably because the Mass of that

day was originally intended to close the Ember-week. The sequence is resumed, so to say, on the fifth and sixth Sundays after Epiphany, on which days the Epistles are taken from Colossians and First Thessalonians respectively. This will seem the less strange if we bear in mind that, when the number of Sundays after Pentecost exceeds twenty-four, the Masses appointed for the last Sundays after Epiphany are used to make up the number. It is remarkable, too, that on each day, Thursdays excepted, from the Saturday before the fourth Sunday in Lent till the Saturday before Palm Sunday, as well as on all the Sundays between Easter and Pentecost, St. John's Gospel is read. And it is difficult to dissociate this fact from the circumstances that, on his own showing, many, if not all, of St. Augustine's 88 "tractates" on St. John were delivered during Lent, and those on St. John's first Epistle, in Paschal time.¹ Beissel, however, insists that no certain conclusion as to liturgical usage can be drawn from this; partly because it is incredible that the Bishop of Hippo can have delivered so many discourses within less than forty days, and partly because some of the "tractates" deal with only a verse or two of the Evangelist.² But St. Augustine's statement that, during the two weeks of the Passion and the Resurrection, he must needs

¹ *Prol. in Ep. I Joan.* (P.L. xxxv. 1977).

² Beissel, *Entstehung der Perikopen des römischen Messbuches* (1907), p. 9. The tractates, he holds, rightly no doubt, were addressed, as "conferences," to a select audience.

interrupt his exposition, because the lessons appointed to be read during those weeks were so authoritatively fixed, is a clear testimony to the fact that a regular system of non-continuous pericopae was, if not yet established for the whole year, at least in process of establishment.¹

For the rest, several of the Gospel lessons indicated by St. Augustine as assigned to particular days of the ecclesiastical year still hold in the Roman Missal the place which, in his day, they held in the liturgy of the African Church. And the schemes of pericopae drawn up respectively by St. Gelasius and St. Gregory—so far as they can be ascertained—show a gradual approximation to that which obtains at the present time.² It may further be remarked that, as in other points so also in the choice of the lessons from Holy Scripture, the Western Liturgies show a far closer relationship among themselves than with the Eastern rites.³

¹ "Sed quia nunc interposita est solemnitas sanctorum dierum, quibus certas ex Evangelio lectiones oportet recitari, quae ita sunt annuae ut aliae esse non possint," &c. (St. Augustine, l.c.) Father Thurston (*Lent and Holy Week*, p. 167) has moreover compiled an interesting table of the Lenten liturgical psalmody showing unmistakable traces of an originally unbroken sequence. Cf. *Cath. Encycl.* i. 581 ff. An article by Dom G. Morin in the *Revue Bénédictine* first, I believe, called attention to this matter. The facts seem hardly to square with Dom F. Cabrol's suggestion (*Origines Liturgiques*, p. 339) that the psalmody was chosen to suit the preceding lesson ("Il ne faut pas oublier que dans ces anciens offices la psalmodie et les leçons sont en étroite connexion").

² Beissel, pp. v., 44.

³ Beissel, p. vi. On the whole subject see also Fortescue, pp. 254 ff.

A word or two may now be said on the relation of the collect or collects to the lessons from Holy Scripture. It will be noticed, on reference to the Roman Missal, that whenever the Gospel is preceded by more than one lesson, the additional lessons, *i.e.*, those which come first, are separated, one from another, by a collect. And although, in a majority of cases, no special relation in point of meaning or purport can be traced between the lessons and the collects, yet, whenever such a relation can be traced, it is invariably between the collect and the lesson which precedes it, not with that which follows it. This is transparently clear in the case of the prayer "Deus qui tribus pueris," &c. ("O God Who for the three children didst temper the fiery flames"), which follows the lesson from the third chapter of Daniel on the Ember Saturdays. And a similar relation is not less plainly evident in the case of several of the Holy Saturday and Whitsun-eve "prophecies" and the prayers which severally follow them.¹

Now these facts suggest a conjecture which may perhaps deserve consideration. Was not the Gospel, and perhaps also the Epistle, originally followed,

¹ Here one may cordially agree with Dom Cabrol when he writes (pp. 339, 340): "Les collectes . . . surtout semblent la plupart du temps dependantes d'une prière litanique, d'une *lecture* ou d'une *psaume* qu'elles ont pour mission de compléter ou de commenter" (*italics mine*). And (referring back to a previous note) it is probable enough that one of the causes which led to the break-up of the original continuity of the liturgical psalmody was precisely the desire to choose appropriate rather than merely successive psalms.

likewise, by a collect? For such a sequel to the Epistle there is, it must be confessed, no trustworthy evidence available.¹ But in the case of the Gospel the question might almost seem superfluous, inasmuch as the word "Oremus," immediately following the Gospel (or, rather, the Credo, which is however of relatively late introduction) to this day bears witness to the fact that something has here been omitted. For, as matters now stand, the invitation to pray is followed by no specific prayer, but by the "Offertorium," originally a psalm, which with its antiphon was not recited by the celebrant at all. Nevertheless, it is not quite clear what was the nature of the omitted prayer. Was it a single prayer of somewhat secondary importance, like the "Oratio super sindonem," which occurs precisely here in the Ambrosian rite? Or was it a series of intercessory petitions, identical perhaps, or all but identical, with those which follow the Gospel on Good Friday? Or is it possible that a twofold change has here taken place, viz., first the substitution of a single prayer, no other than the principal collect of the Mass, for the series of petitions aforesaid, and then the transference of this principal collect from its original place to its present position?

That this last hypothesis, with allowance for the

¹ The Stowe Missal has a collect after the Epistle (Probst, p. 46, MacCarthy, p. 198), or rather, it has two, one in the first hand, the other added (perhaps for alternative use) by Moel Caich; which at least shows the persistence of the usage in Ireland. But it is not safe to draw conclusions from the unsupported testimony of this somewhat wayward MS. The St. Gall fragment is not available for comparison here.

inevitable crudeness of a too compendious statement, is the true one, several indications conspire, if I mistake not, to render at least highly probable. First of all, it is beyond doubt that the "preces solemnes," as we may conveniently call the Good Friday collects with their invitatories, were, in pre-Gregorian and pre-Gelasian days, chanted on many other occasions besides the one on which they have survived. For this we have the all but explicit testimony of Celestine I., and of the author of the fifth-century tract, "de Vocatione Gentium," who plainly allude to them as in common use.¹

On the whole I am strongly inclined to believe that a somewhat complex change has here taken place. If we may trust the analogy of the Eastern rites, this was the original position of the litany, that "lesser litany," originally a deacon's litany, of which something has been said in chapter VI., and which was followed by "the prayer—or prayers—of the faithful."² This latter prayer (or prayers), in-

¹ "Obsecrationum quoque sacerdotalium sacramenta respiciamus quae ab apostolis tradita . . . uniformiter celebrantur, ut legem credendi lex statuat supplicandi. Cum enim sanctarum plebium praesules mandata sibimet legatione fungantur, . . . postulant et precantur, ut infidelibus donetur fides, ut idolotrae . . . liberentur erroribus, ut Iudaeis . . . lux veritatis appareat, ut haeretici . . . resipiscant, ut schismatici spiritum . . . caritatis accipiant, ut lapsis paenitentiae remedia conferantur, ut denique catechumenis . . . misericordiae aula reseretur" (Celest. Ep. xxi. 11, *P.L.* l. 535; cf. *De Vocat. Gentium* i. 12, *apud* Probst, *Abendl. M.* p. 118, note 1).

² Brightman, pp. 9 ff., 38 ff., 159 f., 223 ff., 264 ff. In the Byzantine rite the litany survives before "the prayer of the catechumens" but seems to have fallen out before the prayers of the faithful (*ibid.* pp. 275, &c.).

variable in the East, gave place, in the Western rites, to the variable collect. And finally both the litany and the prayer or prayers which followed it were transferred—either simultaneously or successively—to the present position of the Kyrie and the collect. I suspect moreover that the litany, in its more or less primitive form, underwent a twofold development, viz., (1), in its original position into the “*orationes solemnes*” now recited only on Good Friday, and (2), in its transferred position, into the longer processional litany known as the “*litaniae majores*,” popularly called “the litany of the saints.”

That, moreover, the collect was in fact transferred from its original place after the Gospel to its present position may be inferred with a high degree of probability from two independent considerations, viz., (1) that in the Gallican liturgy, whose Roman origin is here assumed, the place of the principal collect (“*collectio sequitur*”) was undoubtedly not before the lessons but after the Gospel, and (2) the plain statement of the “*Liber Pontificalis*,” that down to Celestine’s time the service began with the reading of the lessons.¹ Nor is it difficult to divine a motive for the transference. For when, in course of time, the dismissal

¹ The “*preces pro populo*” are placed after the Gospel by St. Germanus (*P.L.* lxxii. 92). And the “*Sacramentarium Gallicanum*” or Bobbio Missal invariably places the lessons before the collect, even in the “*Missa cottidiana Romensis*” with which the MS. begins. (*P.L.*, *ibid.* 451 ff.).

of the catechumens fell into disuse, and the "Mass of the Catechumens" thereby ceased to have a distinct existence as such, there would no longer be any reason for postponing the principal collect to so late a point in the service; and its transference to the more prominent position which it now holds might well seem congruous and natural. To cut down superfluities was, as sundry indications show, one of the aims of Roman, *i.e.* Papal, liturgical reformers. It is however possible that the "transference" took place by two stages, viz. (1) by the addition of a collect before the lessons, and (2) by the omission of the collect after the Gospel, as now superfluous. In this case the Ambrosian rite, which has the principal collect before the lessons, but keeps a minor collect, the "*Oratio super sindonem*," after the Gospel, would bear witness to the intermediate stage; and would afford an interesting example of "arrested development." That a somewhat analogous change was made, at an early date, in the position of the Pax in the Roman liturgy, and that this change was probably due to similar reasons, will be seen in a later chapter.

In a later chapter, also, something further will be said about the gradual. As regards the Creed, it must suffice to say, here, (1) that it was introduced into the Eastern liturgies in the fourth century, as a protest against current heresies, but that its position varied in the various rites; (2) that it was introduced into the Gallican liturgy in 510;

but (3) that the Roman Church, on the ground that it had never been affected with heresy, did not introduce it into the Mass till a much later date, possibly not till 1014, when the Emperor Henry III. is said to have persuaded Benedict VIII. to make the innovation. The date, however, though very positively affirmed by Berno of Reichenau, cannot be regarded as quite certain.¹

¹ Bona, II. viii. 2; Fortescue, p. 288.

CHAPTER VIII.

THE OFFERTORY.

BY the "Offertory" of the Mass, in a broad and somewhat popular sense of the term—yet one that is recognized by Bona and other writers of repute—may here be understood all that is said and done between the conclusion of the Gospel, or Creed, or homily, as the case may be, and the commencement of the Preface. As a whole, the Offertory plainly pertains to the sacrificial portion of the Mass, of which it forms a kind of preparatory section, its nucleus or kernel being the preparation of the "oblata," *i.e.*, of the unconsecrated elements. In the Byzantine liturgy, and to a less extent in the other Eastern rites, this preparation has been developed into a somewhat elaborate service, the Prothesis or Proskomidé, which not only precedes the liturgy proper, but, when the full ceremonial of a pontifical function is observed is (or was) carried out by a deputy or assistant priest at "the altar of the prothesis." Dr. Fortescue apparently overlooks this quite characteristic feature of the prothesis, a feature doubtless often or even commonly omitted (just as many ceremonies of High Mass are omitted in a low Mass), and one which may even have passed into desuetude, but which was certainly once observed. "On this point the Byzantine liturgists are explicit and unanimous. From one to another, with merely ver-

bal variations, they hand down the statement of the fact, accompanied with the traditional symbolic interpretation. The service of the prothesis, they say, symbolises the time of the ministry of St. John the Baptist, while our Lord was as yet hidden, and the deputy celebrant represents the Precursor whom the Messiah sent before His face to prepare His way.¹ When Dr. Fortescue writes that "in the East there is no Introit," and that "there is no procession of Entrance because the celebrant and his ministers are already in church when the service begins," his words most probably reflect, correctly enough, the current usage, but they certainly do not describe that of the palmy days of the Byzantine liturgy. There unquestionably is, or was, an introit, "eisodikon," sung at the "procession of entrance," sometimes called "the little entrance." And moreover, "the celebrant and his ministers" are, or were, not already in church, but outside in the narthex; and what is more, all the congregation were there too, till the entrance of the bishop.² Brightman defines "The Little Entrance" as "the entrance of the bishop, after vesting in the narthex during the enarxis, with the people from the narthex into the church."³ In the pontifical Mass, *the bishop still first intervenes at this point*, being fetched from the nave

¹ Lucas, in *Dublin Review*, April, 1893, p. 283, where full references are given.

² *Dublin Review*, l.c., pp. 289 ff. But see Fortescue, p. 298, Brightman, p. 367.

³ The "enarxis" is a short service which followed the prothesis.

by the presbyters and deacons, a deacon carrying the Gospel." It is, however, a kind of misnomer, though of old standing, to call it "the entrance of the Gospel," inasmuch as on certain occasions the Gospel is not carried. It is the entrance of the bishop, preceded usually, but not always, by the Gospel. "In the absence of the bishop the procession . . . is still made," from the altar by the north aisle and "back to the altar by the holy doors." The case is precisely analogous to that of a modern compared with an ancient procession. Originally as Father Thurston has somewhere said, a procession implied a place to proceed from, and another place to which the procession was made. In its modern and sadly shrunken form it is often no more than a circuit, starting from the altar and returning to the same spot. To sum up, "returning to the same spot," there is an introit in the Eastern liturgies, and the prothesis or anticipatory offering of the elements is carried out before it by a priest of rank inferior to that of the pontificating bishop.

A very short preliminary service analogous to the prothesis and preceding the introit is prescribed in an interesting liturgical tract appended to the Stowe Missal.¹ And a somewhat similar usage is observed in the Mozarabic rite, and by the Dominicans at Low Mass. But there is, I believe, nothing at all to show that anything answering to the Byzantine prothesis ever had a place in the

¹ MacCarthy, pp. 245 ff. (nos. 4—6). Another recension of the same, from the Lebar Breac, *ibid.* pp. 259 ff. (nos. 4, 6).

Roman rite, with which we are here chiefly concerned."¹

The history of the offertory in the Roman Mass is somewhat complicated, and on many points so obscure that we are to some extent reduced to the necessity of employing the not very satisfactory method of probable conjecture. For present purposes the subject must needs be very briefly treated. One thing at any rate is certain, viz., that the offertory, as we know it, is the result of a twofold process, first of abbreviation and then of expansion. There can be no reasonable doubt that the interval between the Gospel (or homily or Creed) and the Preface was, at least on more solemn occasions, to a great extent occupied by two ceremonies which, so far as every-day practice is concerned, have completely disappeared from the Mass as we know it. One of these consisted in the successive dismissals of catechumens and penitents, with accompanying prayers; the other (already mentioned in the foregoing chapter) in the prayers for all orders of the Church and for "all sorts and conditions of men," heretics, schismatics, unbelievers, &c., whether in the form of a litany followed by a collect, or in that of the "orationes solemnes" which are still recited on Good Friday.²

¹ "In all Eastern rites and in the Gallican . . . a later practice grew up of preparing (and offering) the gifts before the liturgy begins. Rome alone kept the primitive custom . . . of preparing them at this point, when they were about to be consecrated. The other practice is certainly later" (Fortescue, *l.c.*).

² See above, chapter vii.

At how early a date the dismissal of catechumens and penitents passed into disuse it is impossible to say with any approach to accuracy, the more so because of the great variety of local custom. It seems clear, however, that whereas in the days of persecution such a dismissal at all Masses was a matter of necessity, in the course of the fourth century the ecclesiastical discipline as regards catechumens was more thoroughly systematised, the holy season of Lent (Quadragesima), and to a less extent, that of Paschal time (Quinquagesima, as it was often called) being set aside for their instruction. Hence, in the *Gelasianum* and in the seventh of the "Ordines Romani," which seems to be pre-Gregorian, we find elaborate and very interesting directions for the "Scrutinies" or examination of candidates for baptism, who are, moreover, throughout described as children. It is at least possible that the baptism of adult converts took place after private instructions, at Pentecost. The public "scrutinies" were held in successive weeks of Lent; special days being appointed for the successive ceremonies pertaining to them. But indeed the whole subject of the catechumenate is of sufficient interest to justify, by way of digression, a rather lengthy quotation from Father Thurston's admirable work on the ceremonies of Lent and Holy Week. It will be seen that his observations are in large measure concerned with the reminiscences of ancient usage which still survive in the rite of baptism, no longer carried out, as formerly, in close connection with the Mass. He writes:

“ For modern Catholics, to whom the word baptism recalls no other picture than that of a tiny infant beside the font in the arms of its godmother, it requires an effort of the imagination to conceive how much was done in the early Church to invest this rite of Christian initiation with every sort of solemnity.¹

“ Complete ‘ illumination,’ to use a word which was technically employed in the Eastern Church as almost a synonym for baptism, was only imparted after two years’ preparation and by slow degrees. At every stage the catechumen was wisely made to feel the unspeakable value of that which was being conferred on him in his admission into the Church of Christ. At every stage he was tested to see whether he were really worthy of the privileges of worship; and during the last three weeks of his catechumenate some little ceremony was gone through almost every other day, making an advance towards the climax of that wonderful Easter vigil when at last took place the triple immersion in the newly consecrated water, and the sacramental words were spoken which washed away all his sins and invested him with the spotless robe of sanctifying grace. . . . There was in the first place a formal admission to the catechumenate, now principally represented in the baptismal ritual by the ceremonies which take place at the

¹ It is not, however, to be supposed that all the ceremonies described by Father Thurston formed part of a primitive liturgical usage. In their fullest development they are, I believe, to be ascribed to the fourth and fifth centuries.

church door before the adult candidate is led into the baptistery. . . . Then after the third Sunday in Lent, those who during the past two years or more had given satisfaction and had profited by the instructions given, were elevated to the dignity of 'electi' (chosen ones), or 'competentes' (fellow candidates), and during this last stage of their preparation they went through a ritual which appears in a condensed form in the second portion of our present baptismal service. . . . We may note in particular the solemn delivery and recital of the Creed—in several parts of the world the 'Pater Noster,' a portion of the Gospel, and two of the psalms were formally imparted in the same way—and after that the renunciation of the devil."¹

In the Gelasianum we find special insertions made in the Canon of the Mass on behalf of the candidates and their godparents, similar to those which are still made, on behalf of the newly baptised, in the Masses of Holy Saturday and Whitsun-eve as well as throughout Easter week and Whitsun week. A reminiscence of the ancient practice may also be found in the lessons read on the Wednesday of the fourth week of Lent, which all have reference either to cleansing or to "illumination" or both. The first is from Ezechiel, and contains the words: "I will pour upon you clean water, and ye shall be cleansed from all your filthiness"; and in the second, from Isaiah, we read: "If your

¹ Thurston, *Lent and Holy Week*, pp. 170 ff.

sins be as scarlet they shall be made white as snow: and if they be red as crimson they shall be white as wool.”¹ The Gospel recounts the healing of the man who had been blind from his birth, and was bidden to wash in the pool of Siloë or Siloam.²

It seems almost incredible that the candidates should not have been allowed to remain in the church for the reading of the Gospel, and for the homily which doubtless followed it. Yet the rubrics of the seventh “Ordo Romanus” clearly prescribe the dismissal of the catechumens before the Gospel. This, however, I suspect to have been the result of an innovation on the earlier practice, and one which did not permanently hold its ground. Its origin admits of a ready explanation. If the Creed and the “Pater Noster” were to be solemnly delivered to the candidate, why not the Gospel also? We have already seen, in the passage quoted above, that a “delivery of the Gospels” did, at least locally and at some period, form part of the ritual of the catechumenate. It is, in fact, elaborately provided for, under the title of “*aperitio aurium*—the opening of the ears,” both in the Gelasianum and in the seventh Ordo. It took place on the Wednesday in what we now call Passion Week, when, in presence of the candidate,

¹ Ezech. xxxvi. 25; Isai. i. 18.

² St. John, ix. 1—38. This, however, is not the Gospel assigned to the day in question in the seventh “Ordo Romanus” nor is the lesson from Isaiah there found. (*P.L.* lxxviii. 996).

the initial sections of St. Matthew, St. Mark, St. Luke and St. John, respectively, were read by four deacons from four separate books previously laid on the altar.¹ That the practice, however picturesque and in some respects appropriate, was regarded as an innovation, may fairly, I think, be inferred from the fact that it was disapproved and condemned by more than one provincial or local council.²

The mention of these details might well seem irrelevant to the subject of the present chapter, were it not that a quite overwhelming mass of at least circumstantial evidence goes to show that, originally, the dismissal of the catechumens took place after the Gospel, *i.e.*, at that point in the liturgy with which we are here concerned. As regards the final "passing" of the custom, Bona observes that no trace of it is to be found in documents of later date than A.D. 700, nor is it mentioned, even by way of reminiscence, in the numerous mediæval tracts or treatises in the Mass. To put the lowest limit at 700 or thereabouts seems, however, to savour of excessive caution, and Dr. Fortescue is probably right in saying that the dismissals had become obsolete a century earlier, *viz.*, in the time of St. Gregory the Great, unless, indeed, it was he who gave its quietus to this ritual. No provision is made for "scrutinies" in the Gregorianum; and the survival of the warning "si quis cate-

¹ *P.L.* lxxiv. 1087 f.; lxxviii. 997; Wilson, *The Gelasian Sacramentary*, pp. 50 ff.

² Cf. Probst, *Abendl. Messe*, p. 121.

chumenus, recedat " (" if there be any catechumen here, let him retire ") in the Holy Saturday ritual prescribed in the post-Gregorian " Ordo Romanus I." was probably no more than a mere formality.

I do not know on what grounds Dr. Fortescue dates the disappearance of the " orationes solemnes " or " prayers of the faithful " at about the same time. " They seem," he says, " to have shared the fate of the prayers for catechumens when the discipline of the catechumenate came to an end."¹ Is not this rather in the nature of a convenient rather than a well-grounded conjecture? There is no trace of these prayers in the Gelasianum except on Good Friday, and although one or two MSS. of the Gregorianum prescribe their use on the Wednesday in Holy Week, they form no part of the Mass for that day. On the contrary, it is clearly prescribed that they are to be recited some hours before Mass.² The argument from silence against the common use of these prayers in the time of St. Gelasius would seem to be of precisely the same kind as that from the silence of the Gregorianum with reference to the dismissals. As, however, they seem to have been in use in the time of St. Celestine, we are shut down to a period of about seventy years (430—500) as that during which they fell into desuetude. Their disappearance, it may be observed, is more easily accounted for if it be borne in mind that, as has been pointed out in chapter i., there is no

¹ P. 294.

² P.L. lxxxviii 80 f. Cf. Ebner, *Quellen*, usw., p. 213.

evidence to show that they ever had a place in all Masses without exception, and that in all probability it was only on more solemn occasions, and more especially in penitential seasons, that they took the place of the "lesser litany" with its collect. Or if, with Probst, Duchesne, Fortescue and others, we adopt the hypothesis that their use was more frequent than I am disposed to believe, then we may also accept the further hypothesis, put forward by the first-named writer, that, as the ecclesiastical calendar of feast-days was gradually developed, and as in the Western Church it more and more powerfully affected the liturgy, the lengthy "orationes" were, by degrees, more and more frequently displaced in favour of the festal or dominical collect.¹ How and why the collect came to be transferred to its present position is a question that has been dealt with in the foregoing chapter.

And now the question remains whether, in the Roman rite, the "nomina offerentium," *i.e.*, the announcement of the names of those who had made offerings for the Holy Sacrifice, or of benefactors in general, were, in the fourth century, read during this portion of the Mass. That such was the case in the early Gallican rite is I think beyond reasonable

¹ Probst, *Abendl. Messe*, p. 119. His contention that the "orationes" continued to be said in the "Missa cottidiana romensis" has no support from the Gallican books, which (strange to say) alone, with the Stowe Missal, give this Mass. The "Deprecatio S. Martini" which the Stowe Missal places between the Epistle and the Gospel would seem to be a specimen of the "lesser litany."

doubt. For the title "collectio post nomina" occurring *passim* in the Gallican books, together with the contents of many of the prayers themselves, sufficiently indicate that not only distinguished personages but particular individuals were named. Now the Gallican usage is most easily explained on the supposition that it was derived, ultimately, from Rome. And moreover, although the "orationes solemnes," and the litany which, as is here assumed, often took their place, were in themselves distinct from the reading of the diptychs or "recital of the names" in question, the latter would very naturally and appropriately be attached to them. Thirdly, certain abuses in connection with the reading of the names against which St. Jerome inveighs in a passage to be quoted later, can be more easily accounted for if the names were read at the offertory, than if they had, in his day, found a place in the Canon of the Mass.¹ And fourthly, an apt occasion for the transfer of the diptychs to the Canon might well have been afforded by the disuse, except on special occasions, of the "orationes solemnes," and by the transfer of the litany, to which (ex hypothesi) they had been attached.² The subject will be again dealt with in the chapters on the Canon.

¹ See vol. ii.

² A fifth reason might be found in the prayer "Suscipe S. Trinitas" (the last before the *secreta*), which is, in fact, a slightly modified Gallican prayer "post nomina" (Cabrol, *Dict. de l'Arch. Chr.* i. 606), were it not that this prayer, instead of being a genuine survival from an earlier form of the Roman rite, seems to be rather in the nature of a later

Another rite which unquestionably had its original place towards the close of the Offertory, still using the term in its broad sense, was the giving of the kiss of peace. This is its position in all the liturgies, Eastern and Western, with the sole exception of the Roman; and it is all but impossible to doubt that this single exception is due to a transfer of the Pax from the position which it once held in the Roman liturgy likewise. This question will likewise be dealt with in a subsequent chapter.

But besides the dismissals, the "orationes" or litany, and the Pax, the offertory, as its name denotes, had for its central and essential element the bringing up of gifts or offerings for the Holy Sacrifice. Not, primarily at least, the offering of the gifts to God by the celebrant, but their presentation to the celebrant by the faithful. The gifts thus offered would seem to have been, in the first instance, bread and wine alone; then the custom crept in of offering other things as well, whether for the service of the church or for the support of the clergy or for the poor. Hence the necessity of regulations to the effect that nothing was to be offered, during Holy Mass, except bread and wine. Offerings of oil on Maundy Thursday, and of the first-fruits of the harvest and the vintage, either on certain specified days or when the season

insertion from a Gallican source. Any references to the above-named work (not now accessible) are taken from notes on a single article, on the liturgy of the African Church, made some years ago.

made them possible, were, however, permitted by various local regulations; and finally the making of a "collection," in the form with which we are all familiar, took the place of the older offerings in kind.¹

The mediæval rite, as carried out in Rome, may be thus briefly described. After the Creed, the pontiff or the celebrating bishop, attended by the sacred ministers, descended to the "senatorium," or—as we might say—to the altar-rail, to receive the offerings of the faithful, who presented their loaves "in fanonibus," *i.e.*, wrapped in linen cloths. Strictly speaking, the Pope received only the offerings of the nobility ("principum"). Those of the rest of the faithful were received by the bishop who was on weekly duty ("episcopus hebdomadarius"). The loaves were placed on a large extended linen cloth held by two acolytes. The wine was offered in flasks ("amulae"), from which it was poured by the archdeacon into a large chalice carried by the sub-deacon. This, in its turn, when it became full, was emptied into a larger two-handled vessel carried by acolytes. Meanwhile the "schola" or choir sang the "Offertorium." This originally consisted, like the introit, of a complete psalm with its antiphons ("cum versibus"), or of such a portion of the psalm as was sufficient to occupy the time consumed in receiving the offerings. These were then brought to the altar, the celebrant washed his

¹ Bona, II. viii. 4 ff.

hands, the deacon selected what was needed for the sacrifice about to be offered, and, after the "Orate, Fratres," the secreta was recited while the choir finished the offertorium.¹ Of this lengthy ceremonial, which was in use on solemn occasions more than a thousand years ago, a curious survival may probably have been witnessed by some of my readers at Milan. Here offerings of bread and wine are brought to the sanctuary gates by ten old men ("vecchioni"), and the wine and water by ten aged women, on behalf of the congregation, and are there received by the deacon.² It may be added that, in Rome itself, and wherever the Roman rite is observed, there is a somewhat similar ceremonial presentation of bread, wine and water, on occasion of the consecration of a bishop; while, on the still more solemn occasion when a saint is to be canonized, a procession of clerics enters the sanctuary, bearing not these elements alone, but candles and other symbolical gifts.³

¹ *Ordines Romani*, i. 13 f., ii. 9 f., iii. 12 ff. (*P.L.* lxxviii. 948 f., 972 f., 980 f.). For further details and interesting observations cf. Bona, II. ix. 1; Fortescue, p. 299.

² "Wickham Legg (*Ecclesiological Essays*, p. 53) says that these offerings are not now used at the Mass actually in course of celebration, but at some later one" (Jenner, in *Cath. Encycl.* i. 401 B). Dr. Fortescue presumably has good authority for saying that the custom described above is "a foreign interpolation" in the Ambrosian rite (p. 300).

³ Among these gifts are a pair of doves in a cage, and another cage containing song-birds which in due course are liberated, and which symbolize, as they do in the frescoes

It is to be noticed that no other prayer, except the *secreta*, is prescribed for this portion of the service, either in the Gregorianum or in the Roman Ordines. And, indeed, it seems clear that no other prayers were in fact recited, except perhaps as a matter of private devotion, during the performance of what Anglican writers term "the manual acts" connected with the reception and immediate preparation of the *oblata*.

To such practices of private devotion, to the operation of the principle of "the survival of the fittest," and to those Gallican influences which in more than one particular so powerfully affected the Roman rite, must be ascribed the gradual establishment of the existing series of offertory prayers, first as a matter of custom and then as part of the prescribed "*Ordo*," or, as we call it, the "*Ordinary*" of the Mass. These prayers are six in number, exclusively of the psalm "*Lavabo*,"¹ and of the blessing of the incense and the invocations used during the act of censuring the *oblata* and the altar. They are (1) "*Suscipe sancte Pater*," &c., at the offering of the unconsecrated host; (2) "*Deus qui humanæ substantiæ*," &c., at the

of the Catacombs, the happy spirits of the Blessed. The present writer had the honour to take part in this function on occasion of the canonization of SS. Peter Claver, John Berchmans, Alphonsus Rodriguez, S.J., and of the Seven Founders of the Servite Order. Leo XIII. on that occasion, I believe, ordered that the little birds should not be liberated within the building, as there they would starve.

¹ Ps. xxv.

blessing of the water; (3) "Offerimus," &c., at the offering of the chalice, where the plural number indicates—what is sometimes forgotten—that the prayer should be said by the deacon together with the celebrant; (4) "In spiritu humilitatis," &c.; (5) "Veni Sanctificator," &c.; and (6) "Suscipe sancta Trinitas," &c. Now it only needs a little attention to see that not only is the general purport of these prayers identical with that of certain portions of the Canon, but that they anticipate some of its very expressions. This is more particularly the case with the prayer "Suscipe sancta Trinitas," with its commemoration of the passion, resurrection and ascension, and of the saints. And this fact alone should be sufficient to make us suspect the unofficial and even the non-Roman origin of these items. For such mere repetitions are not in accordance with what has been described as the "austere simplicity" and the strict phraseological economy which is characteristic of thoroughly Roman compositions; and it is not surprising to find that most of these prayers can be traced back to Gallican sources.¹ As illustrating what has been said about "the survival of the fittest," these words of Bona may be worth quoting. "The prayers which are said at the offertory vary [or varied] in various churches, since, as the Roman Church for a long while did not employ them," *i.e.*, had no prescribed prayers for this part of the service, "each church adopted its own."

¹ For details see Fortescue, pp. 305 ff.

The prayer "Deus qui humanae substantiae" is, as Cabrol has observed, a Roman collect borrowed for its present purpose.¹ The statement, however, that the offertory prayers are mainly of Gallican origin, must not be taken to mean that in their sequence and purport they represent corresponding portions of the Gallican liturgy, but only that, taken singly, they originated for the most part "north of the Alps."² At any rate, whatever their provenance, there can be no question as to their beauty, and no one will now grudge the repetitions which, in combination with the Roman Canon, they involve. Dr. Fortescue has well said of these and other liturgical accretions to an earlier and structurally simpler rite: "If one may venture a criticism of these additions from an aesthetic point of view, it is that they are exceedingly happy . . . The Eastern and Gallican rites are too florid for our taste and too long. The few non-Roman elements in our Mass take nothing from its dignity, and yet give it enough variety and reticent devotion to make it most beautiful."³

If, moreover, it be allowable to suggest a thought which carries us a step beyond what is actually expressed in these prayers, we may suitably ask, at this point of the Mass, that as the bread and wine are to be changed into the Body and Blood of Christ, our hearts, too, may be changed into the likeness of His. And in this connection we

¹ Bona, II. ix. 2; Cabrol, *Origines*, p. 110 f.

² Fortescue, p. 183.

³ P. 184.

may well invoke the intercession of our Lady. As the child's hymn has it:

Now, at Thy altar, bread and wine,
Thy priest doth offer; Thou, O Lord
Wilt change them, by Thy power divine
To Flesh and Blood, at Thine own word.

At Mary's prayer, dear Jesus, Thou
Didst change the water into wine;
O take my heart, and change it now
That it may be more like to Thine.

IMPORTANT NOTICE

Owing to the bulk of some of the Manuscripts, it is not possible to complete every work in a single issue of "The Catholic Library." (E.g., *Holy Mass: The Eucharistic Sacrifice and the Roman Liturgy*. By the Rev. H. Lucas, S.J.)

Purchasers who have not ordered all volumes of "The Catholic Library" to be forwarded regularly as published, are therefore requested to give instructions for the remaining volumes of such works to be supplied as issued.

London:

THE MANRESA PRESS, ROEHAMPTON, S.W.
B. HERDER, 68, GREAT RUSSELL ST., W.C.



264-062

L71

Lucas, Herbert

AUTHOR

Holy Mass

TITLE

DATE LOANED	BORROWER'S NAME	DATE RETURNED

